



Office of Worker and Community Transition
United States Department of Energy

Sixth
National
Stakeholder
Workshop
Summary Report

Alexandria, Virginia

June 17-18, 1998

March 5, 1999

To June 1998 Workshop Participants:

The Department of Energy's Office of Worker and Community Transition held its Sixth National Stakeholder Workshop on June 17-18, 1998, in Alexandria, Virginia. There were approximately 300 people in attendance.

These workshops are an opportunity for the Department to highlight elements of Departmental policies and to identify areas needing more formal policy. Most importantly, these workshops bring together local elected officials, union representatives, community representatives, contract managers and Department of Energy staff in one location to discuss the intersecting issues accompanying the dramatic change in the Department's activities. The format for this Workshop focused on discussions of best practices and lessons learned in the process of obtaining an effective and efficient work force.

The June 1998 Workshop also addressed a wide range of work force restructuring and community transition issues critical to the future success of the Department. A ***Workshop Summary Report*** is enclosed in this mailing for your information.

If you have any questions concerning the enclosed document, please contact Laurel Smith at (202) 586-4091. Again, thank you for your time and support of our activities in the mutual interest of resolving complex work force and community transition issues. I look forward to seeing you at our next National Stakeholder Workshop in Chicago, Illinois on May 27-28, 1999.

Sincerely,

Robert W. DeGrasse, Jr.
Director, Office of Worker
and Community Transition

Enclosure

**SIXTH
NATIONAL STAKEHOLDER
WORKSHOP**

SUMMARY REPORT

**Alexandria, Virginia
June 17-18, 1998**

Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
March 1999



TABLE OF CONTENTS

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 1998

INTRODUCTION	iii
 PLENARY SESSIONS	iii
 SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION SESSIONS	v
 OPENING PLENARY SESSION - WELCOME, INTRODUCTION AND CONFERENCE OBJECTIVES	 1
 BUILDING A BETTER LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONSHIP	 2
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	9
 REMARKS FROM U.S. SECRETARY OF ENERGY, FEDERICO PEÑA	 10
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:	14
 SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS - CONCURRENT SESSION 1	
1A. IMPACT OF WORK FORCE RESTRUCTURING ON REMAINING AND TRANSITIONING EMPLOYEES	15
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:	20
 1B. INTEGRATED SAFETY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	 20
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	23
 SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS - CONCURRENT SESSION 2	
2A. DEPARTMENT'S PRIVATIZATION PROGRAM: CURRENT STATUS	23
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	25
 2B. LESSONS-LEARNED IN COMMUNITY TRANSITION ACTIVITIES ..	 29
 2C. CONSOLIDATED CONTRACT FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX	 31
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	33



THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 1998

PLENARY SESSION - MEETING TOMORROW'S CHALLENGES (EARLY SITE CLOSURES)	34
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	38
SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS - CONCURRENT SESSION 3	
3A. PLANNING GUIDANCE FOR CONTRACTOR WORK FORCE RESTRUCTURING	42
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	45
3B. ASSET DISPOSITION PILOT PROJECTS	47
LUNCH PLENARY PRESENTATION - HARNESSING THE CONTRACTOR PROCESS TO ENCOURAGE LOCAL GROWTH	52
SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS - CONCURRENT SESSION 4	
4A. LABOR MANAGEMENT FORUM	55
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:	58
4B. COMMUNITY TRANSITION: PROPERTY POLICY	58
BRITISH EXPERIENCE IN ECONOMIC CONVERSION	61
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	63
APPENDIX A - FINAL PARTICIPANTS LIST	64
APPENDIX B - WORKSHOP AGENDA	91



**SIXTH NATIONAL STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP
SUMMARY REPORT
June 17-18, 1998
Alexandria, Virginia**

INTRODUCTION

On June 17-18, 1998, the Department of Energy's (DOE) Office of Worker and Community Transition convened its sixth National Stakeholder Workshop at the Ramada Plaza Hotel Old Town in Alexandria, Virginia. Approximately 325 stakeholders attended representing DOE headquarters and field offices, contractors, labor organizations, state and local government, education and community interest groups. The meeting addressed the progress made on the issues and challenges identified at the last stakeholder's meeting in Oakland, California on April 9-11, 1997. Also discussed were the full range of the Department's work force issues and creative solutions to the inherent challenges of simultaneously implementing the Department's post Cold-War mission, work force restructuring guidance, contract reform objectives, asset disposition, performance-based management requirements, and business process improvement policies.

The format of the Workshop included several plenary sessions and a number of small group discussion sessions. The small group sessions focused on topics related to labor issues, work force restructuring, work force planning, community transition, and employee concerns. The sessions provided a wide range of views on worker and community transition issues.

PLENARY SESSIONS

The plenary sessions of the Workshop included presentations on the following topics:

- Welcome and Introductions;
- Opening Remarks;
- Building a Better Labor-management Relationship;
- Keynote Speech from Secretary of Energy Federico Peña;
- Meeting Tomorrow's Challenges (Early Site Closures);
- Harnessing the Contracting Process to Encourage Local Growth; and,
- The British Experience in Economic Conversion.

Bob DeGrasse, the Director of the Office of Worker and Community Transition (Office), led the welcome and introductions of the Opening Plenary session. He emphasized the significance of the Workshop in shaping the Office's agenda and activities for the future, and encouraged participants to discuss their expectations and concerns.



Mr. DeGrasse then proceeded to give an overview of how the Office has made a direct contribution to the Department's mission. The overview began by commenting that the focus of restructuring has changed: restructuring is increasingly driven by mission and business. The number of separations has decreased while sites seek stability. Throughout the changes in work force restructuring, Mr. DeGrasse noted, the Office mission remains the same — to mitigate social and economic impacts of restructuring.

Ms. Lavonne Ritter, Commissioner of the Federal Mediation & Conciliation Service, followed Mr. DeGrasse. Her presentation included an historical overview of dispute resolution along with an overview of the Federal Mediation & Conciliation Service's (FMCS) partnership philosophy. She also gave a review of the programs and processes that are offered by FMCS. Ms. Ritter began her remarks by recognizing the fact that the current culture for labor, management and government is a busy and critical one and that there exists an opportunity to build a better and more secure future for the benefit of all through sharing lessons-learned. This concept was woven throughout her remarks.

Secretary of Energy Federico Peña followed Ms. Ritter. The Secretary's remarks highlighted the changes that have occurred in the last seven years since the end of the Cold War and how those changes continue to affect the Department, its employees, its contractors, their employees and the communities in which we perform our work. The Secretary also commended the Department for how it has worked to make a difficult mission a success. He noted that the circumstances faced today have required everyone to work very closely together and to depend on strong and effective partnerships to allow the Department to complete its mission.

Since the beginning of this Administration, the Secretary noted, the Department has reduced its management contractor work force by approximately 45,000 positions, nearly one third below peak employment levels. The Worker and Community Transition program has helped achieve this dramatic restructuring of the contractor work force while limiting involuntary separations. At the same time, these changes have helped the Department realize more than \$2.8 billion in annual savings for a one-time investment of just under \$800 million. The Worker and Community Transition Program has also provided career transition and training assistance that has made it easier for displaced workers to move to new careers outside the Department of Energy.

John Merwin of Fluor Daniel Fernald, led a Plenary Session on Meeting Tomorrow's Challenges (Early Site Closures). The focus of this session was the closure of the Mound Plant, in Miamisburg, Ohio. The first speaker, Leah Dever, Manager of the Ohio Field Office, is responsible for closure and environmental restoration of five nuclear facilities at Fernald, Mound, Ashtabula, Columbus and the West Valley Demonstration Project. All sites are slated for closure by the year 2005. Her presentation included a brief history of the Mound Plant. The next speaker, Jim Powers, Acting Site Manager, Babcock & Wilcox of Ohio, Inc. (BWO), began



working at Mound as part of the management team for the new contract. Mr. Powers commented on plant closure from the contractor's perspective. The next speaker, Gary Nolley, OCAW, Local 7-4200, provided a brief overview of the Mound Plant closure from the workers' perspective. Finally, Mayor Richard Church, City of Miamisburg, provided the community's perspective of site closure.

Mr. Tom Garcia, Deputy Director for Institutional Development, Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), spoke at a Lunch Plenary Session on Harnessing the Contracting Process to Encourage Local Growth. This session reviewed economic development initiatives instituted by the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). Among the elements covered in this session were a general background on LANL's mission and role in the community; the laboratory's economic development program goals; the initiatives introduced to achieve those goals; some examples of substantive results; and the impacts of these efforts on the regional community.

Mr. Tim Knowles, International Research & Graduate Centre, Westlakes Science & Technology Park, Great Britain, gave a presentation on the British Experience in Economic Conversion. Some points he covered were that the British government does not have a role in the strategy for restructuring as it does in the United States, and that there was an early community relationship and a push for continued stakeholder involvement.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION SESSIONS

The small group discussions provided an opportunity for direct, informal dialogue among workshop participants on a wide range of issues. The first session of the Wednesday, June 17, 1998 discussion groups included the following topics:

- Impact of Work Force Restructuring on Remaining and Transitioning Employees
- Integrated Safety Management Program

The second session focused on the following topics:

- Department's Privatization Program: Current Status
- Lessons-learned in Community Transition Activities
- Consolidated Contract for the Nuclear Weapons Industrial Complex

The third session, held on Thursday, June 18, 1998, included the following topics:

- Planning Guidance for Contractor Work Force Restructuring
- Asset Disposition Pilot Projects



The fourth and final session included the following topics:

- Labor-Management Forum
- Community Transition: Property Policy

If you would like more information on the workshop format, or if you would like to obtain copies of handouts from the workshop, please call, fax or e-mail your request to:

Laurel Smith
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585-0110
Phone: 202-586-4091
Fax: 202-586-1540
E-Mail: laurel.smith@hq.doe.gov

In addition, you may download a PDF version of the report from the Office's website at www.wct.doe.gov.



WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 1998

OPENING PLENARY SESSION

WELCOME, INTRODUCTION AND CONFERENCE OBJECTIVES

Speaker: Robert W. DeGrasse, Jr., Director, Office of Worker and Community Transition, U.S. Department of Energy

Bob DeGrasse, Director of the Office of Worker and Community Transition (Office), welcomed everyone to the conference and provided opening remarks. Recently, Congress has challenged the existence of the Department and the Office. Mr. DeGrasse opened his remarks with an overview of how the Office has made a direct contribution to the Department's mission.

The overview began by commenting that the focus of restructuring has changed. Restructuring is increasingly driven by mission and business. The number of separations has decreased while sites seek stability. Throughout the changes in work force restructuring, the Office mission remains the same — to mitigate social and economic impacts of restructuring.

Mr. DeGrasse noted that in this time of dramatic change, restructuring must be responsive to business needs. To that end, the Office has revised its restructuring guidance which is available for public review. He also noted that business objectives are driving the current work force restructuring. Examples include the new Management and Integration (M&I) contract at Oak Ridge; early closure activities at Rocky Flats, Mound and Fernald; and the Defense Program Nuclear Weapons Production concept. The objective of the Office is to mesh business needs with fair treatment of the work force.

In a discussion on community transition activities, Mr. DeGrasse noted that the Office has had success with partnerships to reuse facilities and reduce federal costs, such as the Mound and Pinellas property transfers. The Office is working to clarify policies and procedures for property dispositions, such as departmental guidance and the EPA/DOE Joint Policy on Implementing the Hall Amendment. The Office is also emphasizing the self-sufficiency of Community Reuse Organizations. Mr. DeGrasse commented that community transition is a complicated area bureaucratically, and that funding of community transition activities will not last forever. He also stated that the monies used to date have been very successful in terms of jobs created.

In the area of labor relations, Mr. DeGrasse identified labor-management partnerships that had positive results at: Nevada, Pantex, Mound and Fernald. Mr. DeGrasse also identified privatization and outsourcing as current labor relations issues. He asserted that the fundamental principle of the Office is to reach agreement on fair treatment of the work force. The Office has



prepared a draft *Principles of Privatization and a Privatization Checklist* which are currently available for public comment.

A discussion about the FY1999 budget for the Office, Mr. DeGrasse said that over the last few years, the program has received a lot of attention from the U.S. Congress. He stated that Congress believes the Department of Energy separation benefits are much more generous than separation benefits provided by the Department of Defense and the private sector.

Mr. DeGrasse continued that while the program does not need as much financial support as was provided in the past, now is not the time to do away with the program. The program has demonstrated its cost effectiveness in managing worker and community transition activities. On another budgetary note, during FY 1998, Congress determined that the Office of Worker and Community Transition will be the only source of funding for enhanced separation benefits and economic assistance.

BUILDING A BETTER LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONSHIP

Speaker: Lavonne Ritter, Commissioner, Federal Mediation & Conciliation Service

Ms. Ritter began her remarks by recognizing the fact that the current culture for labor, management and government is a busy and critical one. More so than ever; however, there exists an opportunity to build a better and more secure future for the benefit of all through sharing lessons-learned. She commented that her presentation today would give both an historical overview of dispute resolution along with an overview of the Federal Mediation & Conciliation Service's (FMCS) partnership philosophy. She would also give a review of the programs and processes that are offered by FMCS to assist in building labor-management relationships that can indeed ensure a sustainable and profitable future at worksites in America and fulfill for government agencies the goals of the National Performance Review—resulting in a government that works better and costs less, and helps government, business and labor forge partnerships equipped to face the future successfully.

Ms. Ritter also gave a brief introduction to the FMCS's view on conflict and methodologies for resolving it: how the parties choose to manage and resolve conflict in labor-management relations on a day-to-day basis more often than not determines its success or failure in day-to-day business accomplishments. An integrated approach to business and labor relations, Ms. Ritter said, is very important to the process of growing in the future

Before beginning the body of her remarks, Ms. Ritter cited two individuals in the field of dispute resolution whom she describes as “experts in the field” and to whom she attributes much of what she is sharing about the history, philosophy and practical application of conflict resolution: Dr.



John Stepp, formerly a Federal mediator, then Deputy Undersecretary for the Department of Labor and currently with Restructuring Associates, Inc., and Dr. Jerome Barrett, also a former Federal mediator, now a respected consultant and instructor in labor-management cooperative relations and the “father” of the FMCS model for interest-based bargaining.

According to Ms. Ritter, experts in the field of dispute resolution argue that all disputes are resolved in one of three ways: by exerting power (one party imposing its will on another); by exercising rights (often accomplished through contracts, laws, norms or practices); or by both parties seeking ways to reconcile differences while still advancing their own interests. The history of relations between nations provides examples of all three types of dispute resolution. The first type, exercise of power, is illustrated by warfare, waged at great, often devastating cost to both sides and frequently without reaching long-term solutions. The second type of resolution, exercising rights, is a more civilized, efficient and effective method by which nations resolve disputes. When such rights-based dispute resolution is substituted for a power-based resolution, there is less cost, less damage to relationships and arguably improved results. The third type, focusing on the common interests of both sides, is the most satisfying alternative. It improves relationships and makes possible mutually-beneficial solutions.

Extending these means of resolving disputes into the collective bargaining arena in our country, Ms. Ritter noted, there exists an evolution in dispute resolution practices which mirrors in many ways the history of relations between nations. Prior to 1935 and the passage of the Nation Labor Relations Act (NLRA), the United States had no statutory policies to guide and direct labor relations except in the Railroad Industry. Government allowed labor and management to determine their own relationship and unions existed only when they convinced the employer that it was less costly to recognize them and to bargain than to not do so. This time in history could be characterized as a street fight: in the absence of a statutory framework, the power of the parties determined the outcome of labor relations.

The passage of the Wagner Act, NLRA took the fight out of the street and put it into the ring. The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) became the referee with power to declare certain tactics unfair. The preamble of the NLRA, in fact, states that the basic purpose of the law is to provide a more equitable distribution of power among the parties. The policy itself provides a “rights” basis for resolving disputes. This Act and the establishment of the War Labor Board (which essentially banned strikes during World War II) and the parties experience with that during the War, led them to conclude that rights were superior to power as a means of negotiating and administering a labor agreement. Strike costs were often enormous with lasting damage to the relationship. Thus began the system of grievance arbitration which is now an integral part of our labor relations process. Reinforcing this rights-based approach, between 1945-1975, the U.S. enjoyed a robust period of economic good fortune where it sold all that it produced and, in large measure, dominated the world market for many essential goods and services. Stability in labor



relations became more important than labor costs. Cost increases could be quickly forwarded to the customer by raising prices, but shut-downs resulted in lost revenue.

During this period, Ms. Ritter continued, both sides were too busy making money to get involved in the rough and tumble of power-based bargaining. On occasion, strikes or lockouts did occur as the result of miscalculations, political ambitions or non-economic issues where standards or norms were non-existent. Life and death struggles over institutional dominance or survival were rare. Rights-based bargaining produced rights-based agreements. Labor contracts grew from a few pages to hundreds of pages. Contract language was substituted for trust. Each side attempted to minimize risks by crafting reciprocal restraints. More and more the parties became hopelessly entangled in a web of rules and restrictions.

It is interesting to note, Ms. Ritter said, that these types of labor agreements remain unique to North America. Only in the U.S. and Canada do contracts attempt to codify all workplace contingencies in the form of rights. The result is rigid, third-party dependent, status-quo preserving agreements which more closely resemble cease fire agreements among combatants than rational compacts for organizing work and working relationships.

By the mid-1970's, the shift from power-based bargaining to rights-based bargaining was complete. But just as institutionalization was achieved, the system experienced severe turbulence. Those countries whose economy had been destroyed during World War II were fully recovered and labor costs came back into the competitive equation because quality goods produced in the developed and developing countries around the world were on market shelves at lower prices. Global competition had set in, Ms. Ritter noted.

In addition, non-union employers began competing with great success in what were once almost exclusively unionized industries such as auto, steel, rubber, mining and construction. These factors, along with the new administration's policies in 1981 and a vast pool of unemployed workers created by the recession of 1980-82, gave rise to employers coming to the table, demanding substantial changes in contract language and reductions in wage and benefit packages. All of these forces, plus the changing demographics of our workplaces and deregulations of some of our key industries began to undermine the post-WWII system which had established rights as a means of determining equity and bargaining outcomes.

Reaction of both labor and management to these forces were diverse. While some tightened the screws, seeking to wring additional costs out of existing operations, others engaged in incremental changes which gave the appearance of dynamic change but fell short of any real change. Not that changing in increments should be dismissed—it can be a beginning point, but it must move quickly across the organization to fundamentally change operating systems.



In a third category are employers who, when confronted with these same forces, have recognized that they are amidst a sea of change and must re-examine all elements of their operation, beginning with an examination of their business strategies—principally finding a niche in the marketplace where they can get close to their customer and provide high-quality goods and services in response to rapidly changing customer needs. Any such business strategy requires a human resource strategy that is predicated on labor not as a variable cost, but as the employer's most precious asset. In these instances, unions and employers have been able to form partnerships, recognizing that they share common interests in a common future. And many unions, too, have come to realize that pursuit of a common future through the establishment of common goals and objectives, including the efficiency and profitability of the employer, is the only rational route to employment security.

And it is in these types of collective bargaining settings, Ms. Ritter said, that the parties have begun to move toward an interest-based approach to their labor-management relationship—some much faster than others—in the “interest” of their joint survival.

Research has confirmed that labor-management collaboration is one of two experiments American companies and their unions have undertaken since changes in government policies, global competition and advances in technology have caused unions and business to re-evaluate themselves. The other experiment is one in which labor is considered a cost that damages the bottomline. Some companies, rather than choosing collaboration, have seen labor as a “variable cost, perhaps a most variable of costs” and “when confronted with pressure, they attempted to drive down labor costs and they didn't question management practices.” The result of the latter approach has been reduced hours, reduced wages and in some cases, a reduced workforce.

In contrast, successful collaborative efforts between labor and management tend to share several common elements. First is employee involvement. This type of cooperation makes every employee an entrepreneur by allowing them to plan and manage their work loads. Additionally, cooperative systems give employees meaningful input on the decisions that affect their employment. While that doesn't mean that employees and their unions will necessarily gain representation on the company's Board of Directors, they will – in this type of effort – have a voice in decisions that once were made exclusively by management.

The second element that successful collaborative relationships tend to share is that of reciprocity. What we are talking about here, Ms. Ritter noted, is that employers get what they want—a highly motivated workforce—and workers receive stronger assurances of employment security. Companies that are serious about collaborative efforts are not telling employees that they are a variable cost, but rather, they are a valuable asset and that layoffs are a very last resort.



The third element found in successful collaborative relationships is that employers invest in labor to ensure that employees' skills do not become obsolete and often offer new methods of compensation. This involves training, and retraining, Ms. Ritter said.

Moving from that philosophic examination of power, rights and interests in collective bargaining through a view of the elements of successful labor-management cooperation, the parties have looked to the FMCS to assist them in building a foundation for improved labor-management relationships, not only by assisting them in resolving their collective bargaining disputes through mediation, but also by promoting in those institutions the development of sound and stable relations and fostering the kinds of joint efforts that increase labor-management mutual understanding and ability to resolve common problems.

Much has and will be said about joint programs, Ms. Ritter noted. There are many examples of successful programs and processes; where such programs have not worked so well, any number of factors may be playing out. Examples of these factors are: lack of skills; lack of commitment; lack of communication to rank and file and first line supervision; lack of training at the front line; and lack of support be either union or top management officials. It goes without saying, Ms. Ritter continued, that it is not enough to say "let's dance." All parties involved must learn the steps together, dance to the same music and do the same routine.

For starters, the FMCS suggests that the parties begin by looking at the structure and dynamics of decision-making in their organization, beginning with strategic decisions. Organizations that are customer responsive and that survive will be able to respond strategically, effectively and rapidly to change. A successful strategy for an organization, Ms. Ritter said, is to have shared values at all levels, i.e. a labor relations strategy which includes the respective labor relations and operating officers and international union representatives at the level of their strategic decision-making. While strategic decisions have traditionally been made simply at the upper echelons of organizations, the FMCS suggests that the model of the future include the participation of the international union officers.

The next step, Ms. Ritter noted, is for the organization to look at its collective bargaining decisions. The decisions of the future should provide for more employer profit and for more employee security; mutual gain; and self-managing work teams. The scope of bargaining will be expanded to include anything of importance to the parties, not just permissive subjects.

In the next area, shop floor decisions or decisions on the job, supervisors will need to shed their John Wayne, fast gun, hard rider stereotype and become instead coaches, facilitators—resource people who help employees get what they need to get the work done. The shop stewards, Ms. Ritter continued, will need to be problem solvers, not ambulance chasers and grievance machines. The emphasis in the future will be on procedural fairness and mutual problem solving. The mark



of a good steward, she said, will be that he/she is now part of the solution and responsible for it, rather than being part of the problem. Ms. Ritter commented that most union and management leaders who have taken the leap of faith and made the commitment to work toward this kind of model, have talked about how difficult it was to make the transition—but few want to return to the old way of doing business.

Besides looking at a new approach for decision-making, Ms. Ritter continued, there are three functions that occur in the labor-management relationship which would also need to be addressed in the “organization of the future”: contraction negotiations, contract administration, and extra contractual activities.

- Contract Negotiations: in their traditional parameters, contract negotiations have been likened by Marshall Lewin to “driving into the future, looking out of the rearview mirror.” In many cases, the parties settle for settlements instead of solutions and the problems resurface in almost every negotiation. The key for the future will be to utilize negotiations so that the contract is part of the solution, rather than part of the problem.
- Contract Administration: in the traditional model, contract administration has been largely complaint-driven, litigious, rights-based and dependent on third-party decision-making. It is characterized by the parties giving up ownership of the problem and relying on arbitrators’ decisions. Individual victories are celebrated instead of mutual achievements. The future of labor management relations should promote the celebration of mutual achievements.
- Extra-Contractual Activities: these are the activities in which labor and management have engaged which are outside the four corners of the contract. All too frequently, these activities have been limited merely to housekeeping, and in a hostile environment, they are non-existent, almost as if a wall exists between contractual and extra-contractual efforts. If everyone is serious about the labor-management relationship, the wall must come down. We have to get to how we are going to get an agreement and how to administer it in the interest of our joint survival.

Next, Ms. Ritter outlined some of the tools for change offered to interested parties by the FMCS:

- Orientation to Joint Labor-Management Initiative (OJLMI): introduces essential ingredients of the labor-management relationship. It covers philosophy and value of joint efforts, gives an overview of the economic climate—both national and global— and describes new roles for labor and management. It is a low cost, low risk effective tool to introduce awareness and helps the parties begin an evaluation of what type of change effort they want to pursue.
- Partners in Change: is an organizational development approach to encourage labor and management to plan their future jointly. It is designed for parties who have already made



- a basic commitment to cooperation and is based on the assumptions that (1) change must be confronted proactively; (2) people must be dealt with affirmatively; and (3) new skills are needed to enable the parties to take up a joint effort. It's intended purpose is to help the parties create a joint vision and to explore strategies to achieve that vision.
- *Committee Effectiveness Training*: helps committees and labor-management teams address their task and relationship functions productively. It gives the parties a wide variety of selections from eight different training modules to assist labor-management committees, problem solving and continuous improvement teams to increase their effectiveness. The various modules cover, but are not limited to, communications/listening, problem solving, planning, interpersonal and group dynamics, consensus-building and other group process techniques and problem-solving methods. The fact that labor and management define their own needs and that committee effectiveness training programs are tailored to the parties' own assessment of their needs is key to improvements in their functions and skills. Committee effectiveness training is a sort of all-terrain vehicle—it has brakes, accelerator, steering wheel and all the bells and whistles to help the group get through the peaks and valleys with greater ease and more safety valves.
 - *Dispute System Design*: explores and assists in the decision of more effective means of resolving disputes. Grievance mediation is a fundamental tool, but not necessarily as grievance mediation is traditionally used. In dispute design, grievance mediation may be directed to the exploration of interests and resolving grievances in a format designed to satisfy mutual interests. In addition, FMCS provides training and facilitation services to assist the parties in designing alternative methods for handling disputes which interfere with or conflict with their mutual goals. The Work Assignment Dispute Resolution Process (WADRP), designed by the Southern Nevada Building Trades and Bechtel Nevada Corporation, is a demonstrated successful approach to dispute design.
 - *Interest-Based Bargaining*: encourages a problem solving approach to negotiations. The workshop covers a comparison between the traditional approach and the philosophies, principles and techniques of interest-based bargaining. The process helps us to change our bargaining behaviors, our thinking, and ultimately, our labor agreements so that we are more receptive and responsive to rapid changes. It gives the collective bargaining process greater dignity, respect and recognition.
 - *Relationship by Objectives (RBO)*: is an intensive workshop designed for parties whose relationship is broken or in great danger of being broken. It assists the parties in jointly identifying the barriers in their relationship which adversely affect both their bargaining process and their day-to-day dealings on the shop floor. It allows the parties to jointly formulate a plan of action with timetables and responsibilities in order to overcome those barriers.
 - *Steward Supervisor Training*: provides for tailor-made training based on the specific needs of the parties at this level. It impacts shop floor decisions and contract administration areas, as well as extra-contractual activities and relationships. Combined with OJLMI, it



can be used to introduce people at the lower levels of the organization to the concept of change as, basically, to their rights and responsibilities as parties to a collective bargaining agreement.

In conclusion, Ms. Ritter noted that the country's come a long way in the labor-management relationship arena, but that we've also got a long way to go toward the creation of a foundation for solution-seeking among labor and management, and toward creating partnerships that work and endure. She reinforced that it's important to remember that change is a process and not an event, and that partnerships are a journey and not a destination. As an example of partners on the journey, Ms. Ritter cited Bechtel Nevada Corporation and the Southern Nevada Building Trades. But the question remains for us all: will labor and management and government indeed work together toward a mutually beneficial destination, or will they dally on the detours to their detriment? Only the survivors, Ms. Ritter concluded, will be around to share with us their itinerary for success.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q: What was the role of DOE field staff in the Bechtel/BCTC interest-based negotiations?

A: The role of facilitator – to keep them focused on the process and help them move toward mutual gain outcomes.

Q: What is the role Lavonne Ritter plays in negotiations?

A: Mediator — care that there is agreement not what is agreed upon. Help parties begin process and, put substance in a process.

Q: How do you get two parties to sit down when there's no trust? How do you put them both in the process?

A: While trust is not a prerequisite to start-up, it may require a process such as FMCS' Relationship By Objectives (RBO) to begin building a relationship where the relationship is very fragile or broken.

Q: Regarding the role of FMCS, can you identify two or three roles played that would assist parties in the negotiation process?

A: 1) In interest-based negotiations, the role is that of a facilitator, with a process orientation and focus. 2) In traditional negotiations, the role is that of a mediator, to help the parties unfreeze positions, explore possibilities for settlement. The mediator role is both substance and process



oriented. 3) A hybrid of facilitator/mediator depending upon the needs and relationship of the parties. 4) In all roles, we try to assist the parties in focusing on the issues, not personalities.

Q: What are the fragile aspects of negotiations and labor-management relationships?

A: Leadership turnover makes building a solid relationship foundation difficult. Downturns in business severely challenge the parties. Failure to invest in joint training and business education is still another factor. Lack of skills and understanding of each parties' interests always tests the relationship and challenges the negotiation process.

REMARKS FROM U.S. SECRETARY OF ENERGY, FEDERICO PEÑA

Secretary Peña was introduced by Bob DeGrasse. Following is the prepared text as provided by the Secretary's Office:

Thank you, Bob, for your introduction. And thank you all for being here.

The changes that we have seen in the last seven years since the end of the Cold War continue to affect the Department, its employees, its contractors, their employees and the communities in which we perform our work.

We are, in fact, on course to continue cleaning up and shutting down sites that the country no longer needs. While we are pleased at the prospect of reducing our nuclear arsenal, you and I are faced with many challenges as we try to adjust to these changing times.

Ours is a very different mission now; it has gone from a build up to a shut down mode. And, if the Russians ratify START II this year, the downward trajectory of arms reduction we have seen will continue. The implication for us is evident: a continuing reduction in our arms manufacturing process that will further reduce our role in that arena.

When we change the way we do business, the Department affects workers and communities. We will engage those affected by change, and we will include them in our efforts to accomplish our mission.

Despite the implications for us, I must commend you for how you have worked to make a difficult mission a success. The circumstances we face today have required us to have to work very closely together and to depend on strong and effective partnerships to allow us to complete our mission.

Since the beginning of this Administration, the Department has reduced its management contractor work force by approximately 45,000 positions, nearly one third below peak employment levels.



The Worker and Community Transition program has helped achieve this dramatic restructuring of the contractor work force while limiting involuntary separations. At the same time, these changes have helped the Department realize more than \$2.8 billion in annual savings for a one-time investment of just under \$800 million.

The Worker and Community Transition Program has also provided career transition and training assistance that has made it easier for displaced workers to move to new careers outside the Department of Energy. The program is benchmarked with the best business practices in the private sector and the experience of the Department of Defense.

Initially, much of this restructuring was done in response to budget constraints and to bring the work force into better coordination with ongoing mission requirements.

While the pace of restructuring has moderated, the worker and community transition task is not over. We still anticipate between 3,000 and 5,000 contractor workers will be affected for each of the next several years.

The challenges we now face involve transitioning the work force to new, more efficient, contracting mechanisms; retaining the right work force to achieve early closure of designated sites; and assuring the right skills are available when needed for an evolving mission.

Achieving these goals will demand increased flexibility and creativity in developing work force restructuring strategies that meet our business needs, while still meeting the objectives of section 3161.

In this environment, we have gone from an Management and Operations (M&O) to an Management and Integration (M&I) approach, and we are analyzing the impact of that management strategy. The jury is still out. We are also looking at privatization options. We are still in the process of evaluating this approach, but I am hopeful that properly applied, it will help the Department reach its goals.

Regardless of our eventual conclusions about that approach, clearly, fair treatment of workers in this transition is an essential element of making change possible.

One of our challenges is to retain good workers while our sites are being closed and tasks are being completed. This is a serious challenge for us, especially if the Nation's economy maintains its present course of growth and expansion.

It may be difficult to retain workers who can see the end of their jobs approaching and who can see other opportunities for themselves and their families. We have to do some serious thinking about how we accomplish this part of our mission.



At today's stakeholders' conference, there will be an important dialogue on providing training and other assistance for workers leaving the Department of Energy. In some cases, this assistance may be linked to an employee's agreement to remain as long as the Department's mission requires.

There will also be lively discussion of principles for dealing with work force transition issues related to privatization actions. Balancing business efficiency objectives with fair treatment of affected workers is a challenge that can only be met through frank and open discussion.

Let me give you an example of how the Department of Energy accomplished its mission more effectively by being sensitive to the concerns of workers and communities -- specifically, in the communities of Miamisburg, Ohio and Pinellas, Florida.

Five years after the decision to convert unneeded facilities to commercial use, the Pinellas facility was transferred to the local community. Since that time, over 500 private sector jobs have been created and are now housed in the old nuclear weapons facility.

We completed our responsibilities at Pinellas 18 months ahead of schedule at a savings of at least \$29 million to the American taxpayers.

At Mound, we are on track to close out our activities by 2005, three to four years earlier than expected, at a savings between \$150 and \$200 million. Already, the community is using buildings on the site to support over 200 private sector jobs and have agreed to take the entire site after we complete the cleanup.

Neither of these accomplishments would have been possible if we had not sought to develop partnerships with the local communities and worked to earn the trust of those affected by these changes.

Since 1993, on average, communities have created one job for every \$11,000 in adjustment assistance provided. This ratio is as good as the best benchmarks in the economic development world. According to a GAO report, for example, all federal assistance for base closures resulted in roughly one job per \$35,000 in assistance provided so our record is three times better.

An additional challenge is our dependence on transportation systems for the orderly integration and exportation of waste materials. However well we might have done our jobs, we still are going to be subject to other factors that might complicate our schedules, goals and timelines for cleaning up and closing our sites. Legal and other kinds of challenges can be mounted at any time and can disrupt our intentions. We must try to anticipate those issues and address them to avoid litigation.

In Nevada, we proved that effective partnerships can work. Our contractors and labor worked together recognizing that we have a common goal that can only be met as a team. A total of 32



separate agreements have been integrated into a single agreement through interest-based bargaining strategies that will benefit the Department, the contractor and the work force.

I want to especially recognize the work done by Lavonne Ritter of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service for the many hard hours of work she devoted to making our experience at Nevada a success. Similar success to realize a co-operative labor-management relationship is being achieved at the two Ohio closure sites Mound and Fernald, and efforts are underway at several other sites to carry out this new spirit of cooperation.

But in order for our approach to work, that is, to be able to do the things that are needed when they are needed, we must have consistent funding from Congress. This applies to those funds directly dedicated to accomplishing the mission as well as funding necessary to provide the tools needed to mitigate the impact of these changes on workers and communities.

Given the constraints Congress is under, the Department has done well thus far in the Congressional review of the Fiscal Year 1999 budget. But I am concerned that the significant reduction proposed in the Worker and Community Transition account recommended by the House Energy and Water Development Subcommittee could undercut our ability to continue the success we have achieved thus far. Be assured, that the Department will do all it can to make the Congress aware of the acute need for a healthy worker and community transition program.

The job we all have to do is part of a great American tradition. It is an important as winning the Cold War. We have to continue to be focused on the goals that we have set for ourselves.

During my service as Secretary of Energy, I have been proud of the work that each of you has done in this challenging arena. On behalf of a grateful Nation, I want to thank you. Your job is not easy, but you are doing it well.

Thank you very much.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q: What can be done to address the bureaucratic related problems some communities have encountered with regards to asset disposition?

A: Should not have problems with bureaucratic inconsistent messages — the process should operate smoothly.

Statement: Asset sales policy of DOE is to provide economic assistance to communities — should be as supportive of communities as possible.

**Q: What is the sense of Congress's will to continue cleanup of Hanford?**

A: An obligation exists with the Federal government to clean up sites, but it has to be done better. Some members believe we should not put as much money in cleaning up all the sites and that we should just build a fence around some sites. We must, however, be more focused because contaminations are increasing and cleanup is a national challenge. Overall, we are pleased with what Congress has done in the FY 1999 budget.

Q: Will there be handicapped efforts by the Department in the transition of the Grand Junction Plant since it is not a 3161 site?

A: If a proposal is submitted, maybe the Department can incorporate it into the budget.

Q/Statement: Attention of DOE is needed to let them know more money is needed to clean up Oak Ridge.

A: Oak Ridge is not being overlooked by the Department. We at Headquarters are aware of the challenges. I am also aware of a study of people medically affected by health problems at Oak Ridge and would like to reemphasize that cleanup is a national challenge. We need an agreement involving all governors and we need to go to Congress as a united front.

Q: What guarantee is there that the Administration is supporting cleanup programs?

A: The Administration supports the program and has asked for sufficient funding.

Q/Statement: Privatization is not cost effective.

A: The problem is how the Department uses the word "privatization." Pure privatization means DOE no longer has a role. (Environmental Management involved the private sector in helping the Department clean up its sites). The Department must conclude that privatization is cost effective.

Q/Statement: Privatization does not result in fairness to the workers.

A: We have to work with contractors regarding labor relations — the effort cannot work without partnership.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS - CONCURRENT SESSION 1



1A. IMPACT OF WORK FORCE RESTRUCTURING ON REMAINING AND TRANSITIONING EMPLOYEES

Moderator: Marilyn Balcombe, ORISE

Speakers: Eileen McNeely, Boston University, School of Public Health
David O'Connell, Boston University, School of Management
Gail Fairhurst, University of Cincinnati, Center for Environmental Communication Studies
Susan Holliday-Cox, Star Access, Inc.

This session was designed to provide an overview of the impact of work force restructuring on remaining and transitioning employees. It included discussions on the effective ways to mitigate impacts to remaining workers; effective communication and leadership styles for transition; and how to help individuals leaving DOE sites.

Dr. Marilyn Balcombe, an Industrial Psychologist with the Oak Ridge Institute for Science Education (ORISE) and currently detailed to the Department of Energy's Office of Worker and Community Transition, began the session with a few brief comments on the need to "focus on the 'human' in human resources." Work force restructuring actions have a major impact not only on those directly affected or separated, but also on those employees remaining behind. How these remaining employees are affected is a topic of great concern to the Department in general, and to the Office of Worker and Community Transition in particular. The concern for this issue among the Department's stakeholders is reflected in the fact that sessions related to this topic have drawn the largest response in the last two Stakeholder Workshops.

The speakers in this session were selected to address several of the issues surrounding the impact to remaining workers. First, Dr. Eileen McNeely and Dr. David O'Connell, both from Boston University, reported on the progress to date of a project (funded by the Office of Worker and Community Transition) to study the effects of downsizing across the complex on remaining workers. Second, Dr. Gail Fairhurst, University of Cincinnati, Center for Environmental Communication Studies, described the results of a single case study of the impacts of work force restructuring on communication and leadership efforts at the Fernald site. Last, Ms. Susan Holliday-Cox, Star Access, Inc., discussed the career counseling efforts employed at the Department's headquarters facility for contractor and Federal employees affected by restructuring actions.

Dr. McNeely began by describing the methods employed for their study on the impacts to remaining employees. Four basic research questions were addressed: 1) what are the impacts of restructuring; 2) what actions have been taken; 3) what are the obstacles; 4) and what are the next steps. Their team conducted interviews with 12 focus groups of remaining employees across



several sites, talked with over 50 Human Resources professionals at 14 sites, and then coded the transcripts of these discussions to search for common themes.

What are the impacts of restructuring? The results were categorized at the individual, organizational and site levels. For individuals, the leading concerns were job insecurity, high stress, and low morale. At the organizational level, key concerns include the ability to recruit (creating a competitive disadvantage in the market for the Department and its contractors), loss of appropriate skills (through the separation action), increased turnover (losing the best and the brightest), and declining training budgets. This combination suggests a coming ‘train wreck’ for the Department. At the site level, the data clearly reflects a majority of employees having difficulty in coping with the situation. The study also identified certain risk factors that were predictors of how difficult the layoffs were for each site; in particular, the type of layoff (voluntary or involuntary), the characteristics of the local economy (could it absorb the layoffs), and the uncertainty surrounding the remaining site mission.

What actions have been taken? Several initiatives by various sites were identified as supporting the goal of addressing these potential impacts to remaining workers. Changes occurred in the areas of communications (greater frequency and the use of more appropriate media), career development (assisting employees to look ahead several years), coping strategies, HR policies (aimed at giving back some control to employees), and the actual reduction-in-force steps taken. In addition, some sites have taken action to address staffing needs, training, and management development initiatives, among others. Areas where improvements are needed (on a site-by-site basis) include: greater commitment to addressing these issues; current approaches are uneven -- ranging from one day seminars to complete overhaul of relevant systems; the need for more direct efforts -- some programs are actually designed for other purposes and are utilized for restructuring-related needs only as a by-product of that effort; and better performance measures for determining effectiveness and identification of what else is needed.

What are the obstacles? Two basic issues serve to inhibit success in addressing impacts: control and culture. Interviewees expressed concern that the ‘arms length’ relationship that they felt should exist between the Department and the contractor is non-existent; that the Department micro-manages operations. As one put it, “If you never know how much budget you’re going to get, then you’re forced to a year-to-year planning as opposed to more of a long range planning.” The culture of Department sites was also cited as a problem. Focus on small planning horizons, annual budgets, mission uncertainty, and contractor changeovers all serve to inhibit success. Further, managers state that workers have an ‘entitlement’ mentality that makes it difficult sometimes to make the hard decisions that are necessary in restructuring actions.

What are the next steps? Several actions were suggested that might serve to address the impacts to remaining workers. The Department could decentralize control, increase survivor-related



resources, limit involuntary layoffs, and stabilize contractor relationships. Further, contractors should carefully assess site impacts, target survivor initiatives, evaluate progress and innovate their culture in an effort to support these actions.

Dr. Fairhurst reported on a site-specific study conducted at the Department's Fernald site in Ohio. The study was borne out of the problems associated with an earlier restructuring at the site -- a site-wide communication audit (1992) suggested a highly fragmented culture, expectations of long-term employment, restricted information flows, and widespread distrust on the part of the employees. Their team analyzed the current state of work force restructuring at Fernald through the use of case study analysis, interviews, observations, questionnaire and archival analysis. This study was conducted as a pilot study in an attempt to test some new methods for studying communication methods and leadership issues associated with work force restructuring actions. Particular attention was paid to those Fluor Daniel Fernald (FDF) and DOE individuals charged with managing work force restructuring and the employees affected both now and in the future.

Forty-seven interviews were conducted for this study; nine with FDF and DOE management, nine with salaried FDF employees, and 29 exit interviews with employees after meetings announcing work force restructuring actions for certain job classifications. The findings are classified into two groups: the FDF and DOE management and salaried interviews, and the 29 exit interviews.

From the FDF and DOE management and salaried personnel, the following findings were suggested:

- First, there is strong evidence that organizational learning was occurring for those who dealt directly with work force restructuring as lessons-learned from earlier efforts were carried through to later initiatives.
- Second, the presence of a strong senior leader was key (as many described the FDF President) -- someone with a strong commitment to balancing the interests of the site with the interests of the transitioning employees.
- Third, the presence of a senior leader with a "velvet boot" vision was indicated -- FDF's human resource manager formulated an innovative vision of the work force restructuring effort, including a focus on 'managed attrition,' giving employees a 'two-year' look ahead on manpower planning efforts, for better personal planning, etc.
- Fourth, the study found that key leadership and management functions performed with respect to the "velvet boot" vision.



- Fifth, the contractor exhibited a proactive section 3161 and customer orientation -- section 3161 was initially seen as a constraint for the contractor, but came to be viewed as an opportunity, and the basis for many of the concepts of FDF's restructuring vision.
- Sixth, it was evident that a strategically managed relationship between FDF and DOE existed on work force restructuring, a 'teaming partner' relationship was identified. This relationship countered the traditional 'arms-length' view of government oversight of contractors.
- Seventh, there was a well designed communications strategy on work force restructuring, particularly concerning message clarity, timing, voice, frequency, and channel. There was also a heightened sense of language, so terms were more clear and user friendly.
- Finally, there appears to be an ongoing, inevitable, complex tension between work force restructuring advocates and the leadership team, the Inspector General, and labor.

The exit interviews suggested the following:

- First, they generally endorsed the FDF/DOE communications strategy with respect to work force restructuring.
- Second, it appears that trust in top management has remained stable with 1992 levels. This suggests that trust is not easily restored in today's organizations in the age of corporate downsizing.
- Third, the study found that the intransigence of the wage culture remains although its impact may be diminishing, suggesting possibly that many wage employees are still in denial over site closure.

In conclusion, the study begs two important questions: first, how will this velvet boot vision of work force restructuring play itself out over time, and second, what lessons-learned can be transferred to other sites. A definitive answer to the first question may not be available until after several more restructurings, as numerous roadblocks to success will surely surface as restructuring proceeds. The second question, the keys to success for FDF/DOE have been: 1) outside the box innovative thinking; 2) a willingness to take risks; 3) perseverance; and 4) a concern for relationships. To the extent that these characteristics exist at other sites, contractor and government representatives should be able to successfully apply or improve upon the ideas developed at Fernald.



Ms. Holliday-Cox, Senior Career Counselor for the Department of Energy's Career Management Resource Center (CMRC), discussed the recent restructurings at the Department's headquarters and the role the CMRC plays in employee transitions. She addressed the efforts on an organizational and individual level, both past experiences and present situations (i.e., the remaining employees), as well as highlighting the available resources and services provided by the CMRC. The CMRC provided services such as relocation guidance, career planning, career and personal assessments, assistance with Internet resources, referrals to community resources, interviewing practice, computer skills upgrades and resume critiques. They also provide workshop and seminars on issues like developing job search skill and entrepreneurship, supported guest speaker series and held career fairs for employees.

At the organizational level, those program offices that addressed restructuring issues early by coordinating their actions with available CMRC resources, incurred much smoother transitions, both before and after the reductions-in-force (RIF). For others, there was a wide variation in RIF communications (notices varied from 1 day to 6 months, some notices given then rescinded, etc.) which damaged management credibility and interfered with ongoing productivity concerns. At the individual level, the emotional impact of restructuring varied, ranging from devastation to anger to eagerness for the new opportunity. The outcomes for individuals also varied, ranging from finding new opportunities immediately, to others taking over a year to land new jobs.

For the remaining organization, two years of chaos caused setbacks to group effectiveness and productivity. However, there were some positive effects: improved strategic planning to avoid future RIFs, focus on succession planning, cross training and a move to flatten organizations and a shift toward more employee empowerment and innovation in work place issues. There were also some positive and negative affects on the remaining employees. On the negative side, many were less trustful and more cynical, unsure of their roles (but afraid to ask), and unexpressed angers are now surfacing which exacerbate existing problems. On the positive side, more employees are actively adjusting to new work structures and better managing their careers, some are seizing the opportunity to make life changes, and others are exhibiting increased signs of empowerment.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q: Does the information provided by Ms. Holliday-Cox relate only (mainly) to Federal employees at Headquarters?

A: No, there are some contractors that make use of our services.

Q: Was the downsizing at Oak Ridge considered fair and compassionate?



Comment: None of the panelists were specifically qualified to address the “fairness” of that particular effort. Another attendee commented that he had seen downsizing in several environments, and that Rocky Flats (his site) had done a good job under difficult conditions. He also mentioned that it’s important to remember that the managers are just trying to do the best that they know how—there is a human impact on the managers and supervisors as well as the employees. Finally, a comment was made that there is a big problem with those left behind if the restructuring action is perceived as not fair.

1B. INTEGRATED SAFETY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

MODERATOR: Barry Lawson

SPEAKERS: Juan Alvarez, Mason & Hanger Corporation, Pantex Plant
Duane Smith, Metal Trades Council, Pantex Plant
Skip Maas, Mason & Hanger Corporation, Pantex Plant
Dennis Kelly, Amarillo Area Office, U.S. Department of Energy

This session provided an overview of the Pantex Plant Integrated Safety Management Framework, including a detailed description of the Voluntary Protection Program (VPP) and the Enhanced Work Planning (EWP) process. Juan Alvarez and Skip Maas, from Mason & Hanger Corporation provided information from the contractor’s perspective, while Duane Smith from the Metal Trades Council, presented the perspective of organized labor. Dennis Kelly from the Department of Energy Amarillo Area Office provided the Area Office perspective of the VPP.

The VPP is an integrated part of the safety management at the Pantex Plant. To attain DOE-VPP status, participating contractors must have management systems in place for at least one year that address the five basic elements of an effective occupational safety and health program: management leadership and commitment, employee involvement, work-site analysis, hazard prevention and control, and safety and health training. Applications for participation in the DOE-VPP program typically undergo rigorous review at three organizational levels: operation/area offices, cognizant secretarial offices, and the DOE-VPP Headquarters office. Once the application is completed and determined to be acceptable, and independent onsite review team is fielded to conduct an extensive onsite evaluation. Pantex began the VPP process in March 1994. A seven-member continuous improvement team was formed in the spring, followed by a twenty-member Steering Committee in the fall.

The VPP relies on employee participation and is concerned with employee safety. The VPP is one indicator that Pantex is a safe place to work, as well as being a safe contribution to the community. The program promotes positive morale and relationships among employees. Because



of fewer accidents, employees do a better job and go home in the same condition as when they arrived on the job.

The key to the VPP success was to have the steering committee drive the implementation and to get management support of the committee decisions. To begin, the steering committee visited OSHA-VPP sites to provide a benchmark for the Pantex program. The committee visited Dow Chemical, Sterling Chemical, and Star Enterprises. During this process, the committee saw how the VPP could work at a production facility. They then developed the Safe Work Awards Program (SWAP), the Hazard Identification Teams (HIT), and the VPP Employee Handbook.

They also devised various promotional ideas for awareness, including crossword puzzles, banners and posters, introduction of the VPP logo, the VPP hotline, Halloween bags, a safety calendar, and a coloring contest for children. The new awareness initiatives included monetary On-the-Spot Awards and Safety Excellence Awards, bingo and pizza parties, and a Pantex safety film.

Management commitment to the program was illustrated by allowing employees the opportunity to learn about VPP, initiating programs to improve safety and create a culture change, financing promotional and other divisional awareness initiatives, providing personnel time to conduct HIT inspections, and encouraging employee involvement in the safety program. The underlying premise of the VPP is by encouraging employees to get involved in problem solving, managers and supervisors provided them with the opportunity to be creative. This increases employee ownership of their own safety, and they are much more likely to support the safety program

To evaluate the success of the VPP, several safety indicators were used. In FY 1997 there was a 20 percent reduction in required first aid, a 30 percent reduction in TRC, and a 33 percent reduction in lost time due to safety related incidents.

In addition to the VPP, the panel provided an overview of the Enhanced Work Planning (EWP) process currently being used at Pantex. EWP, introduced in FY 1996, is formally recognized as a significant part of the Plant's Integrated Safety Management System. The Facilities Division assumed the lead for EWP, and it became a grass roots program. EWP is a tool that evaluates and improves the site processes by which work is identified, planned, approved, controlled, and executed. The key elements of EWP include line management ownership, organizationally diverse teams, a graded approach to work management, worker involvement beginning at the earliest phases of work management, and organized, institutionalized communications.

The EWP process continues to reduce overhead cost and administrative functions. One example of its effectiveness is the dismantlement and decommissioning of 23 Safe Secure Railcars. There was a four-month reduction in procedure development and review time; the project was



completed weeks ahead of schedule and under budget; there were no injuries of any kind; and the project received the Al Gore Hammer Award.

Dennis Kelly, DOE Amarillo Area Office, then provide a comprehensive model of the Pantex Plant Integrated Safety Management Program. Integrated Safety Management (ISM) includes defining the scope of work, analyzing hazards, developing and implementing controls, and performing the work safely. The model also includes program direction and feedback and improvement. An integral component to the process is worker participation. . Several attributes of ISM include worker empowerment and ownership, management commitment, team approach, integration of worker and safety disciplines into work execution, coordination and communication, hazards identification and assessment, and controls tailored to work. As a result of the ISM, total recordable cases rate has steadily declined since FY 1995, explosive related occurrences have steadily declined since FY 1996, and the radiation material violations have dropped dramatically since FY 1996.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q: Can you tell us about the cover up at Pantex that was aired on PBS in March?

A: An evaluation will be conducted at the end of the year. The production technician issue was settled by the Department of Labor with a favorable outcome, although it found fault on both sides. Sensitivity training was recommended

Q: What about privatization at Pantex?

A: We have not really looked into it.

Q: What has been done to improve or encourage employees with regards to their safety and the safety of others?

A: We encourage employees to speak out by providing incentives. We conduct shop safety meetings.

Q: How are injured worker issues handled? How are safety issues handled? Do employees have the power to stop work if a safety issue is involved without fear of losing their jobs? What about the VPP Agreement and the bargaining agreement?

A: We have established written policy guidance that any employee can stop work if a safety issue arises without fear of retaliation. We are not familiar with the collective bargaining agreement.



SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS - CONCURRENT SESSION 2

2A. DEPARTMENT'S PRIVATIZATION PROGRAM: CURRENT STATUS

Moderator: Barry Lawson, Lawson and Associates

Speakers: Walter Howes, Contract Reform and Privatization Project Office,
U.S. Department of Energy

This session provided an overview of the Department's perspectives on privatization and related work force transition issues. Walter Howes, the new Director of the Department's Contract Reform and Privatization Project Office (Project Office), spoke about the new office and the role it will play in the Department's privatization initiatives. Mr. Howes has been with Project Office for three months and has a background in raising capital for energy-related technology development projects as well as experience in the privatization initiatives of foreign countries, specifically Argentina and Czechoslovakia. The session included a brief overview by Mr. Howes, followed by a more lengthy question and answer period.

The focus of the new Project Office, will be Department-wide, although there will certainly be a significant amount of early attention paid to Environmental Management. Defense Programs and the laboratories will also be addressed. The Office Director reports to the Secretary of Energy. To date, the budget and mission have been approved, and new staff is being recruited from the private sector to support the mission. Specifically, they are looking for financial engineering type skills not traditionally found in the Department, as well as training personnel.

Mr. Howes indicated that the privatization initiative is centered on improving management practices in the Department -- determining how to use market forces to achieve more effective and efficient management. He stated that there is no static definition of privatization. He acknowledged that it is a controversial issue and that the formation of his office is somewhat of a response to several policy shifts in recent years. Initially, contracts were on a cost plus basis, which provided the wrong incentive to contractors and led to cost overruns. The policy then swung too far in the other direction, to all performance-based contracts (which he stated was also not the right approach). Now his office will try to bring the discussion and policy back to the center.

Mr. Howes suggested that there are 13 to 14 types of risk involved in government contract work, and privatization now addresses who is best able to handle certain types of risk. For example, the private sector may be better able to handle risks associated with timing, construction, and performance, while it may be more appropriate for the public sector to handle regulatory risk. This risk-based approach should bring about more stable management practices.



He stressed the need to work together to use limited funds more effectively and efficiently as Congress is looking closely to see if we succeed. One of the motivations to look into privatization and performance-based activities in the first place was a GAO document addressing the role of private sector capital in government programs. This report addressed the cost of private versus public capital and the different risks associated with each. While private sector funds were seen as more expensive than public sector funds, one must take into account the typical cost overruns and inefficiencies associated with some public sector funding to make a proper comparison. For example, the GAO report also indicated that 65 percent cost overruns were typical of public sector capital, which means there's a lot of room for improvement.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q: Who in Rocky Flats should we start talking to about privatization issues? Some of the subcontractors have some ideas they want to put forward, but they don't know where to start.

A: Start with your Rocky Flats management, but you can always come to the Contract Reform Project Office. We are available to help.

Q: How will labor be involved in the privatization process from the beginning?

A: Everyone must work together on this for it to work. You should work directly with my office, as well as the Office of Worker and Community Transition on these issues.

Comment: At Savannah River, when a privatization proposal is made, we convene a privatization core team with Federal and contractor employees; that's one way to get labor involved. (Mr. Howes indicated that the Project Office would look into this model as a means for structuring the process).

Q: At Rocky Flats, the process is addressed in negotiations. The company is required to provide cost analysis to labor on any privatization initiatives. The problem has been in implementation -- the company provides limited information, the communications are not good on this issue. Every privatization effort proposed has been determined to have cost savings associated with it, but I know that most have been more costly. We need somebody to assess these costs better. The process is flawed, or we're going ahead with privatization no matter what, which is also a problem. (Someone asked for an example of a failed privatization effort and the cold laundry was suggested. It was indicated that the group hired to do the laundry could not keep up with the need, and there were occasions where clothes were not available when needed.)



A: The pursuit of cost savings is pervasive. Privatization has been suggested as a way to getting new dollars -- this is an inappropriate way to look at privatization and will stop. Also, I don't believe it's true that privatization always leads to greater costs. The drive is for better outcomes, which may mean more safety, faster clean-up, etc. The drive to improve is important, not just to reduce the cost.

Q: What is the relationship between contract reform and privatization?

A: The distinction between the two offices should go away. Mr. Howes read the Contract Reform Mission Statement and noted that there is a Web site coming by the end of the summer that will address these issues more fully.

Contract Reform Mission

The guiding principle of the office is that private sector practices can be optimized to assist senior Department managers to more efficiently and effectively accomplish the Department's mission in a changing environment. In that regard, a main goal of the office is to stimulate innovation in order to better manage change in departmental programs and in order to help ensure a proper allocation of risk in business and management strategies. A main objective of the office is to assist in the coordination and development of the Department's overall business strategy and to champion integrative management systems.

This office is established to guide and coordinate the implementation of the Department's privatization and contract reform initiatives, to facilitate and oversee their implementation, and to represent the Department in dealings with outside entities. The office will also develop and coordinate the overall Departmental business and management strategy in conjunction with the Department's senior managers. Although operating responsibilities will remain with the program offices and the field organizations, the office provides a focal point for coordinating and facilitating Contract Reform and Privatization activities throughout the Department.

With respect to privatization initiatives, the office will represent the Office of the Secretary in coordinating privatization policy development and implementation, strengthen procedures for oversight and review of privatization projects, and establish mechanisms to incorporate best practices and "lessons-learned." The office will focus primarily on contracting out activities throughout various program areas -- providing expertise to ongoing programs and projects and working to identify and develop new opportunities that offer the potential for improved cost-



efficiency. In the areas of privatization categorized as asset transfers and divestiture of function, the office will provide assistance to lead programs.

With respect to contract reform, the office will work with the Procurement Executive to ensure the institutionalization of this initiative, which was launched in 1994. The office also has concurrence authority on major procurement actions, and will participate with programs in advance business and management planning.

The office reports to the Deputy Secretary. This reporting relationship assures prompt access to senior Department management, thereby furthering innovative approaches and policy resolution.

There is no further subdivision within this organization.

Q: So the definition of privatization is better management practices -- it's a tool not a program?

A: At its core, it is an 'incentive alignment.' It is an opportunity to align incentives to the task responsibilities.

Q: What are some examples of good Department privatization efforts, and why?

A: One example would be the privatization of the power plant at Savannah River. That effort works because it's an opportunity to deliver a homogenous commodity, it's a well understood technology, all the issues involved are well known, and it had the potential to grow (apply power elsewhere).

On the other hand, it's not yet clear if the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) privatization is a good candidate. There are many complicated issues involved with moving weapons grade materials.

Demonstrating a new technology is also a difficult candidate for privatization. The Federal government should probably bear the risk for demonstrating new technologies.

Q: What did you save at the Savannah River power plant, and what were the impacts to the work force?

A: (Personnel from Savannah River responded) It's more cost effective; the savings were the cost of a new power plant capacity. There was a big savings in avoiding the cost of a new plant. The work force members who wished to move to the new group were allowed to do so.



Q: What do you think about the dual track process (like the Tours facility in Richland, WA)?

A: The issue is how to bring about the optimum degree of competition, especially when there's only limited experience in a new technology. A lack of competition was the reason for Tours. Therefore, the dual track process was a good idea as the competition increased, the price of the bids dropped down considerably.

Q: Competition drives down prices, not privatization. Let everyone enter the game, including labor. Let them prepare a package to compete.

A: Yes, there are opportunities for labor to bid against privatization actions (for example the utility services at Richland). We want to encourage these opportunities for labor and others as privatization proceeds.

Q: Regarding the cost of capital: the Alliance for Nuclear Accountability says that firms like BNFL have an unfair advantage compared to US firms, with lower cost of capital for British firms (makes their bids more competitive).

A: There are some valid points in that argument, but the cost-of-capital logic is flawed. Consider the GAO report: you need to look at the 'net effective cost of capital' -- what it costs to get something done. In the earlier example, the government may be able to get funding at a cheaper rate than the private sector, but with 65 percent cost overruns, the net effective cost of capital increases considerably.

Q: What is the distinction between privatization and outsourcing?

A: I don't make a distinction; it's all about risk engineering. Privatization does bring in private sector dollars (putting their money at risk), which is not necessarily the case in outsourcing.

Comment (Bob DeGrasse, Director, Office of Worker and Community Transition):

A copy of the draft DOE privatization policy is available. You're encouraged to take a look. The policy will be implemented in a fashion similar to the Work Force Restructuring Planning Guidance -- we do not intend to make it a regulation.

**2B. LESSONS-LEARNED IN COMMUNITY TRANSITION ACTIVITIES****Moderator: Bob Baney****Speakers: David Trojnar, PerforMax³****Tim Carlson, NTS Development Corporation****Jeff Finkle, National Council for Urban Economic Development (CUED)**

Bob Baney, Office of Worker and Community Transition, opened the session by introducing the speakers and giving the themes of their respective presentations.

David Trojnar, a former Human Resources Director from the now-closed Pinellas Plant in Largo, Florida, gave a presentation on the challenge of maintaining productivity and morale while in the midst of a complete shutdown. His case study examined five years of experience at the Pinellas Plant. After a major layoff in December, 1992, DOE identified the Pinellas Plant on September 8, 1993, as a facility that would be closed. The focus of leadership then became to prepare the employees for life after the plant closing.

He discussed the key points of change that focused on the constant state of change in which we live and work. Mr. Trojnar explained that the way the leadership of an organization reacts, as demonstrated by their actions and statements, will determine whether transition will be successful.

He next compared the changes that occurred at the Pinellas Plant from 1992 to the present. In 1992, the work environment was very stable, salary and benefits were high, and there was a paternalistic relationship between the M&O contractor and the employees. After the plant closing, 90% of the employees changed careers and now take full responsibility for their own job security within private business. By creating strategic objectives and focused, practical tactics, the management team maintained high levels of employee commitment. The benefits and compassionate treatment by Lockheed-Martin and DOE also helped to accomplish the objective of keeping people committed to safe shutdown of the plant.

Mr. Trojnar then focused on the specific situation experienced at the Pinellas Plant. He examined the objectives, tactics, and results. A big change for management was switching a major part of their emphasis from a production orientation to dealing with people's basic needs. By doing so, they felt able to maintain morale among the workers who were left in the work force. They found that communication was essential, that news must be disseminated as quickly as possible and every concern should be addressed. Mr. Trojnar then provided a summary of significant results, including: no litigation, no workplace violence or sabotage, and closing the facility three years ahead of schedule, saving \$29 million.



Mr. Trojnar concluded with a short discussion of his own personal experience in forming the company PerforMax³. He showed how he took advantage of some of the benefits and opportunities as the Pinellas Plant closed.

Tim Carlson, NTS Development Corporation, was the next speaker. He described the performance of the transition at the Nevada Test Site north of Las Vegas, Nevada. He began by discussing Kistler Aerospace, a private firm that will use a portion of the Nevada Test Site for a re-usable launch facility for the commercial satellite industry. The company has already done considerable development on their launch vehicle and expect to be able to perform their first launch within the next two years. Tim attributed the success of their program to date to a combination of luck, assessing the assets and community characteristics, and hard work. In his discussion of the program, he brought out the needs the company is seeking to fill and the steps they have taken to be innovative and to resolve some of the problems that have surfaced.

Mr. Carlson then outlined some of the other programs at the Nevada Test Site. He stressed that the Community Reuse Organization (CRO) tried to select programs and partnerships for their situation carefully, such as the Hydrogen Enriched Lean Burn and other alternate energy programs. He concluded by mentioning the CRO at the Nevada Test Site has plans that will contribute to self-sufficiency by the year 2000.

Jeff Finkle from the National Council for Urban Economic Development concluded the program by examining performance measures. He mentioned that the guiding principles for any performance measure is to determine the information that is sought and the rationale for seeking it. The reasons for seeking information were listed as follows:

- S Accountability
- S Influence over performance expectations
- S Program improvement
- S Contract adherence

The purpose for gathering the information will affect the parameters of the data collected.

He then discussed the distinction between performance measures and benchmarks and then provided examples of performance measures which included a mix of objective and subjective measurements. Mr. Finkle then began a discussion of the measurement of performance for community transition activities, including factors that affected performance. Among the topics he addressed were: calculating the cost-per-job, the time frame, jobs resulting from different types of projects, project objectives, location, and the facility of data gathering. It was also mentioned that Federal agencies use different definitions of cost per job, project scopes, and time frames which make comparisons between agencies difficult.



He concluded with a set of recommendations for measuring performance that would contribute the most benefit to the managers of the program. By using the information collected, the managers could determine the continued need for the program as well as the appropriate policies to follow.

2C. CONSOLIDATED CONTRACT FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Moderator: Marilyn Balcombe, ORISE

Speakers: Earl Whiteman, Albuquerque Operations Office, U.S. Department of Energy
Felix Ortiz, Albuquerque Operations Office, U.S. Department of Energy

On June 4, 1998, the Department of Energy announced a proposal to consider consolidation of as many as six existing contracts at Department's nuclear weapons program production facilities into a single management contract has been released for industry, community and other stakeholder comments. The announcement was issued in *Commerce Business Daily* on June 4, 1998. The contract would be awarded in early 2000.

This session provided an opportunity for the Department of Energy's Albuquerque Operations Office to provide information on the proposal and to get feedback regarding some of the issues work force restructuring stakeholders may have concerning the proposal. The session was not considered an opportunity for stakeholders to make formal comments on the proposal. Participants were asked to make formal comments using the official comment process.

Earl Whiteman from the Albuquerque Operations Office began the session with an overview of the proposal for the Consolidated Contract for the Nuclear Weapons Industrial Complex . Handouts also provided an overview of consolidation proposal.

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is actively considering the consolidation of its nuclear weapons industrial activities into a single contract. This would include the existing contracts at the Kansas City Plant, the Y-12 Plant in Tennessee, and the Pantex Plant in Texas; and potentially, the weapons production responsibilities at Sandia and Los Alamos National Laboratories in New Mexico and tritium operations at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina. The consolidated contract would centralize management and operating responsibility for DOE's entire Nuclear Weapons Industrial Complex (NWIC), and should provide significant benefits to DOE in improved programmatic execution and potential cost savings.



The NWIC has experienced significant restructuring and downsizing of its infrastructure and work force over the past several years, and this will continue into the future. These changes are consistent with the December 1996 Record of Decision on the Stockpile Stewardship and Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. A key element of the strategic planning is the transition to smaller and more efficient production operations consistent with the needs of a smaller nuclear weapons stockpile. Toward that end, the Department has been exploring various ways to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of its management of the NWIC contractors.

Programmatically, the use of a single contractor could consolidate accountability for production operations that is currently distributed among up to six different contractors. A single contractor could also bring a unified production focus and better integration of priorities and resources; clearer lines of authority and responsibility among the sites; improved inter-site cooperation, information sharing, and technical integration; and greater retention and utilization of technical expertise. In addition, the DOE would expect the contractor to bring its commercial and corporate "best business practices" along with its ability to improve the efficiency, coordination, and integration of all production sites, similar to the significant savings and operational improvements realized through recent mergers in the private sector. In parallel with these contractor changes, DOE will be exploring opportunities to improve Federal management of Defense Programs.

Potential contract cost savings could be achieved by eliminating duplication of certain functions and reducing overhead. Additional cost savings should come from shrinking levels of management, integrating production support functions, standardizing and integrating technical and operating support systems, and consolidating subcontracts. There are also risks and costs involved in contract consolidation. The Department of Energy would want to see a vigorous competition for a large, consolidated contract; but may not attract an adequate number of competitors due to the complexity and other challenges of the job, or teaming among potential competitors that would limit the number of actual proposals. With one consolidated contract, DOE might be overly dependent on the performance of a single contractor. A consolidated contract that delivers improved performance and cost efficiencies could likely have impacts on both contractor and federal jobs, and on the companies who hold the existing contracts. Finally, there may be significant up-front costs including work force restructuring, overlap of contractor costs during the transition, and other single system implementation costs.

The Department of Energy has developed a concept paper on contract consolidation, which is available on the Internet (<http://www.doeal.gov/nwic/>). A public announcement was made through a *Commerce Business Daily* notification. The Department of Energy is seeking industry and other interested individuals comments on the concept, in writing and through individual meetings.



In identifying reasons for the proposal, Mr. Whiteman stated that DOE is looking for a different way to conduct business. The Department of Energy is moving towards a smaller complex and is doing a different kind of work.

The vision of the consolidation is to achieve effective and efficient management of the Nuclear Weapons Industrial Complex. The approach to consolidation will: (1) consolidate contracts so there will be a single M&O contract; (2) improve cost and fee incentive; (3) consolidate/centralize functions; and (4) utilize a single business system. There will be no change in mission between the sites.

The objectives of the consolidation are to capitalize on best business practices; improve efficiency, coordination, and integration; strengthen performance accountability; and enhance corporate support/involvement with DOE.

The potential benefits of the consolidation include:

- Clearer lines of authority/responsibility
- Standard streamlined processes
- Cost savings that will allow reinvestment in NWIC infrastructure through:
 - S Consolidation of overhead/support
 - S Consolidation of production support
 - S Consolidation of other functions
 - S Single system effectiveness

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q: In regards to general administration/overhead, can a contractor in the name of better business practice move such function from one site to the other?

A: Yes, the Department would encourage such action.

Question/Statement: DOE influence would become less and contractor role will be much greater.

A: DOE responsibility in regards to community involvement and site ES&H would be unchanged — we would need to define the Federal organization before an award is made.

Q: Why was Nevada excluded from the list?



A: DOE looked at the site, but it was determined that Nevada's mission did not lend itself to be included on the list.

Q: When the changeover occurs, what will happen with regards to the collective bargaining agreements?

A: Existing collective bargaining agreements at each site would be unchanged by this action.

THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 1998

PLENARY SESSION

MEETING TOMORROW'S CHALLENGES (EARLY SITE CLOSURES)

Moderator: John Merwin, Fluor Daniel Fernald

Speakers: Leah Dever, Ohio Field Office, U.S. Department of Energy
Jim Powers, Babcock & Wilcox of Ohio, Inc.
Gary Nolley, Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union
(OCAW), Local 7-4200
Mayor Richard Church, City of Miamisburg

John Merwin of Fluor Daniel Fernald introduced the session topic and speakers. The focus of this session was the closure of the Mound Plant, in Miamisburg, Ohio.

The first speaker, Leah Dever, Manager of the Ohio Field Office, is responsible for closure and environmental restoration of five nuclear facilities at Fernald, Mound, Ashtabula, Columbus and the West Valley Demonstration Project. All sites are slated for closure by the year 2005.

Ms. Dever presented a brief history of the Mound site, which began with tritium production in 1948. The site was placed on the National Priorities List in 1989, was then determined a closure site in 1992, and production stopped in 1994. In 1997, Babcock and Wilcox was selected as the new closure contractor. In January 1998, the decision was made to sell Mound to the Mound Miamisburg Community Improvement Corporation (MMCIC) to be used as a technology park in the future. Cleanup work at Mound includes 55 buildings scheduled for demolition or removal, as well as the excavation of the Miami-Erie Canal. Progress is being made and cleanup is ahead of the initial schedule.

The federal work force at Mound consists of around 100 employees, all of whom had to be convinced that closure was going to happen and was a good idea. Solid planning was implemented to ensure the success of closure. Planning began with the Department's strategic



vision which stated that the site would be closing. Planning for closure was then integrated into EM's strategic vision and the Ohio Field Office vision. Comprehensive project baselines were then developed to encompass all work that needed to be done prior to closure.

The work force is consistently evaluated in terms of strategic alignment during an annual staffing summit which provides an opportunity to determine critical skills and essential positions. The transition plan for the work force was developed by the employees themselves. They wanted tuition reimbursement for training outside the scope of their current position, they wanted retention bonuses, and they also wanted to address the involuntary reduction-in-force process. The Ohio Field Office is working with the DOE Field Management Office to understand the options available for federal employees. There are some opportunities for existing federal employees to transfer to other DOE sites. New hires are aware that their jobs will be eliminated in 2005. The key is to motivate and encourage people to stay in critical positions until closure.

The next speaker, Jim Powers, Acting Site Manager, Babcock & Wilcox of Ohio, Inc. (BWO), began working at Mound as part of the management team for the new contract. Mr. Powers commented on plant closure from the contractor's perspective. Though DOE is closing down operations at Mound Plant, the Mound site is not going away. This presents the BWO team with a particular challenge. Over the next five years, DOE and the contractor will literally go out the back door while private enterprise will be coming in through the front door.

The existing work force consists of over 700 employees out of a work force that at one time numbered over 2,000. These workers have already seen a tremendous change. They are being asked to change again.

BWO recognized the need for more flexibility in the way assignments were made to represented workers. Changes to the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union (OCAW) agreement were negotiated to allow fewer classifications of workers to do a larger variety of tasks under much simpler work rules. With an investment in training for cleanup work, the existing work force will come away from their current assignments with marketable skills appropriate to the remediation industry. Environmental remediation is extremely complex. These activities must be conducted by a work force that is skilled, knowledgeable and flexible. They also must be willing and able to tackle the upcoming tasks.

Mr. Powers stated that salaried positions are also changing. People who were hired years ago and have dedicated their careers to the defense of the Nation, are facing changing times. Not represented by a union, many of them feel abandoned or discarded by the industry they have supported for their working lifetime. He noted that getting them to apply their skills with enthusiasm is a real challenge.



There is also a period of adjustment for the new owners of Mound. There is an extensive period of coexistence. The three parties involved all have different relationships with each other. DOE has negotiated a sales agreement with the MMCIC, and DOE and BWO have a contract which requires BWO to perform to a budget and a schedule, but there is no contractual relationship between BWO and MMCIC.

To bridge the lack of a common contractual bond, a reuse partnership council was formed. This allows a forum for communication of needs and wants pertinent to the three parties. The partnership council sets a stage for meaningful progress. The council forum provides an opportunity for: 1) understanding of each other's limitations, strengths and abilities; 2) motivation to stay focused on the goal; 3) a commitment to open, honest communication; and 4) respect for each other.

Mr. Powers stated the transition to private enterprise is inevitable. When DOE is gone, Mound will still be a part of the community at Miamisburg. Many of the people currently working at Mound will still be working at Mound. This time for private industry making high quality products or services and they will look back at this time of transition as simply another interesting part of their history.

The next speaker, Gary Nolley, OCAW, Local 7-4200, provided a brief overview of the Mound Plant closure from the workers' perspective. Workers have gone through many work force changes from Monsanto, to EG&G, and now BWO. The workers have formed a partnership with the contractor. They are committed to working hard toward the successful closure of the Mound Plant.

Mayor Richard Church, City of Miamisburg, provided the community's perspective of site closure. Mayor Church presented an overview of what has happened in the city of Miamisburg since the Department of Energy decided to close the plant and eliminate its 1,800 jobs. At the outset, Mayor Church stated that while many communities are facing the challenges of defense conversion, each community has to approach closure in its own way.

In 1993, when DOE announced that the Mound Plant would close within five years, Mound was a place where brilliant scientists and engineers used the most advanced technologies to develop and manufacture detonators for nuclear weapons. It was also a place that had some environmental problems, and was designated a Superfund site.

Knowing of DOE's decision to close Mound, the community had two options: close the gates or move towards defense conversion. Although it was an uphill battle, the community chose defense conversion. This was the only way to preserve what the country had invested in so heavily, to keep people working and to maintain Mound as a positive force in the local economy.



With DOE as its partner, the community accepted the challenge of defense conversion. The first step they took was to establish the Miamisburg Mound Community Improvement Corporation (MMCIC) as an arm of the city. The MMCIC would manage and coordinate all the city's efforts at Mound. After the MMCIC was formed, the Mound Reuse Committee was created, consisting of a group of citizens who represent various community interests in decisions about Mound's cleanup standards and future uses. The next step was to establish the following vision for the site: "To establish the Mound Advanced Technology Center as a privately owned, economically viable industry and technology park by the year 2005."

The goal at the Mound Plant is to build businesses around its technological capabilities. Mayor Church stated that Mound has a lot to offer manufacturing companies needing research and development capabilities and solutions to their problems. Historically, Mound's geographic region has been a manufacturing mecca, the community is building on that history by focusing their economic development efforts in four industries — automotive, aerospace, machine tool and information systems.

MMCIC developed an economic development plan which included three programs geared to helping Mound employees who wanted to start businesses around their technologies: (1) MMCIC sponsored classes that taught Mound employees about starting and running a business; (2) MMCIC established a business incubator to nurture start-up businesses, providing low-cost lease rates, shared administrative services, and technical assistance; and (3) MMCIC provided loans to help some of the businesses get started. Mayor Church noted that there are approximately 20 businesses which have been started by former Mound employees.

The MMCIC marketing and networking program is another major initiative that supports Mound workers who have started new businesses. There is a synergy of technologies on the Mound campus; combined they represent a one-stop solution for companies with manufacturing problems. This one-stop feature is heavily marketed to industry. They have also combined certain equipment, facilities, and skills into technology packages which have been marketed. The goal is to attract a company or companies that would build a business around one of those technology packages. MMCIC also encourages the privatization of site contractor's work to leverage work for Mound businesses. A Mound company could rely on a start-up base of business while it markets its services to other customers. This effort has not yet been successful.

Mayor Church continued to note that there is momentum for the region to establish itself as a center of technological excellence. The community sees a role for Mound businesses in this initiative and has created linkages with the key players in the area, such as, the Materials Command at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and the University of Dayton Research Institute.



There are many important pieces of the puzzle that allows the community to move forward toward commercialization of the Mound site. But the greatest accomplishment to date occurred last January when a sales agreement was signed to convey ownership of the site from DOE to the MMCIC. This breakthrough allows MMCIC to make commitments for the future — commitments that give private business owners a comfort level with making investments in building improvements and equipment.

Since the beginning, the Mound effort has faced numerous challenges and obstacles to economic development. The greatest challenge resulted from the fact that neither DOE nor the community had ever gone through defense conversion before. So they were inventing the process as they went along, resolving disagreements about responsibilities, equipment and the best path forward.

Mayor Church stated that much of what has been accomplished at the Mound site has been made possible through the Office of Worker and Community Transition, especially Bob DeGrasse, through his support of the MMCIC goals. Mayor Church is optimistic about the future of the Mound Advanced Technology Center and the prospects for former Mound employees who have become business leaders, as well as the new businesses that have come to the site.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q: To Gary Nolley: From a Union perspective what unique challenges are you facing as your site moves ever closer to a final closure mode and what efforts are being taken to prepare for eventual separation of your membership?

A: We have developed the Partnership Council between DOE, the contractor, and labor. We meet weekly to discuss projects. Our long-term contract also guarantees employment through 2002.

Q: To Jim Powers: Please discuss the differences between your initial expectations of being a closure contractor and the realities of being a prime contractor to the Department of Energy?

A: I was surprised with the low morale at the site. There was a high level of frustration and sadness. The reward mechanisms weren't working.

Q: To Leah Dever: Being relatively new to the Ohio Field Office you are in a unique position to look at the task at hand objectively, that is to say, the Ohio Field Office has five sites scheduled for closure, what factors seem to be working the best to enhance the accelerated clean-up of these sites?



A: There are many things that are working. For example: 1) The vision statement is a powerful tool to communicate what we are doing. The strategic plan is a tactical tool for how we are going to do it. 2) There is uniqueness and similarity across the five sites. The sites meet at the summit to share lessons-learned. It allows us to find new answers. 3) We try to find deployable technologies. I need something that is going to work today, not five years from now. 4) We have buy-in from stakeholders and regulators. They are as committed to closure as we are. 5) We have team work. The Partnership Council is very important. 6) We have a positive attitude — a can do attitude.

Q: To Mayor Church: Intentions, perceptions and reality are not always one in the same in the world in which we live. As the City of Miamisburg begins their partnership with DOE and eventually Plans to assume ownership from DOE, what events or opportunities did happen or needed to happen to insure a successful transition?

A: We formed an alliance with employees. The Mound Citizens Action Group meets weekly. I also think the community needs to step up and take charge. The community needs to speak with one voice. There must also be a partnership among all entities.

Q: To Gary Nolley: From a broad perspective, what efforts need to be, could of been, or are being taken to make the eventual transition of the Mound Plant a success in the eyes of your work force?

A: The contract extension was the biggest factor, the work force is more settled. I tell my people to get ready for 2002. Communications have improved. Trust has to be visible for transition to work.

Q: To Jim Powers: As a closure contractor, how are you managing to maintain a positive work environment, retaining the skills you need and keeping morale high with a workforce who's jobs are eventually going to be discontinued? What innovative solutions are you considering and how do you deal with the workers caught in the middle, those not making high salaries or part of a bargaining unit?

A: We have a positive work environment. We have implemented a number of initiatives such as the exit-equity share program where employees receive one share per every quarter they stay employed. This provides retention money for staying until closure. We also provide quick recognition for good deeds. We have hope for the future and we concentrate on fairness. We are judged by our actions, not our rhetoric.

Q: To Leah Dever: From your initial presentation it is obvious that you believe in the philosophy "What's good for the goose is also good for the Gander" in that your staff is



undergoing some of the same types of Manpower Planning as the contractor. What thoughts are being given to the sharing of resources across contractor/federal lines as the sites continue to get smaller? Do you see the eventual sharing of training staffs, HR staffs, purchasing staffs as a feasible plan under the OFO?

A: We share federal resources as we get smaller and smaller. We use help from other operations offices. We use the financial administrative resources at Oak Ridge and the training resources at Savannah River. We have also used TeleVideo training resources. We will start looking for technology support. We will get people coming into the Ohio Field Office on detail for a year or two. We also have to remain clear about DOE federal duties versus contractor duties.

Q: To Mayor Church: What advice do you have to offer other sites as they move towards a smaller and more concentrated operation while at the same time making facilities open for public use and employment?

A: It is important to form partnerships with other communities in the area, such as the Energy Communities Alliance. It is also important to set goals, be flexible, and think outside the box.

Q: To Jim Powers: How does the Exit-Equity Program work?

A: Employees get shares that will be cashed out at the end of the project. We need to keep those critical skills.

Q: To Leah Dever: What was the peak employment at DOE-OH?

A: The peak employment was 270 employees, which is up considerably from when the staff was considered the Dayton Area Office and received services from Albuquerque. The current Federal work force for all Ohio Field office projects is 225.

Q: To Jim Powers: How are you dealing with the skills mix issue?

A: We rely on subcontractors. As you know, there have been problems with the traditional manpower planning.

Q: What is the current staffing level at the site?

A: There are approximately 700 BWO employees, 100 federal workers, 30-50 subcontractors, and approximately 260 non-DOE business people working at the site.



Q: To Jim Powers and Leah Dever: As you approach closure, what is the feeling among the work force concerning preference in hiring?

A: Jim Powers: That depends on the stage in one's career and how enmeshed they are in the community. Leah Dever: Part of the transition plan for the federal workers is to request other Federal agencies to consider our employees first. DOE can also provide relocation assistance to federal workers.

Q: To Gary Nolley: Are any union members taking advantage of the section 3161 training opportunities?

A: Everyone that wanted to get retraining was able to sign up for training under section 3161 and our contract.

Q: To Mayor Church: Can you briefly describe the process of transferring property from DOE to non-DOE usage?

A: The process has been a two year process and is very complicated. It would be difficult to discuss it in the detail required during this Q&A session. (Note: Attendee was invited to talk about the property transfer process after the session.)

Q: To Leah Dever: How cooperative will other installations be for hiring DOE-OH federal workers?

A: Right now the cooperation is not high because all the Operations Offices are facing downsizing. But as time goes on and after we have cut to the bone, opportunities may arise. People have to be willing to move if they want to stay with DOE. I am hoping that the opportunities will be there in the years 2002 and 2003.

Q: To Mayor Church: What is the salary structure of new businesses and the new jobs created? Is there a discrepancy?

A: Yes, there is a discrepancy. The base salary is lower. The new businesses are typically start-up business, which traditionally have lower salaries. Right now about 60% of the private workers at the Mound site are displaced Mound workers.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS - CONCURRENT SESSION 3



3A. PLANNING GUIDANCE FOR CONTRACTOR WORK FORCE RESTRUCTURING

Moderator: Barry Lawson, Lawson and Associates

Speakers: Terry Freese, Office of Worker and Community Transition, U.S. DOE
Bob Card, Kaiser-Hill Company, LLC

This session provided an opportunity for open discussion on any issues raised in draft revisions to the *Planning Guidance for Contractor Work Force Restructuring*.

Terry Freese, Deputy Director, DOE Office of Worker and Community Transition, gave an overview of the Department's work force restructuring activities to date, highlighting how restructuring was accomplished in the past and the changes in the restructuring environment that led to a new approach for future restructurings. Mr. Freese was followed by Mr. Bob Card, President and CEO, Kaiser-Hill Company, the management and operating contractor for the Department's Rocky Flats site. Mr. Card gave a site-specific overview of work force restructuring actions at Rocky Flats, one of the Department's closure sites.

Mr. Freese noted that the initial work force restructurings incorporated large, episodic reductions, often budget driven, where announcements of several thousand reductions were made at one time, followed by periods of no adjustments. During this period, voluntary programs predominated, with 88 percent of separations being on a voluntary basis through 1996. This initial approach to work force restructuring required each site to develop multiple plans, with a new plan for each episodic reduction. Often there was confusion as to which plan applied (those in place or the new plan under development for a new action). Due to bureaucratic challenges, plans were frequently approved after restructurings occurred. Accompanying uncertainty about the long-term size and structure of the work force undercut the ability to conduct long-term work force planning.

Key changes in the Department's restructuring environment served to move the restructuring methods away from the initial approach. These changes included the development of long-term strategic plans (e.g., Stockpile Stewardship Programmatic EIS, EM Paths to Closure) which identified future operating expectations at the sites, including several sites moving to closure in 5 to 10 years. There were also changes in the contract mechanisms employed across the Department, including a move towards incentive (performance-based) contracts, an increased utilization of privatization and outsourcing efforts, and the new management and integrating approach used at Oak Ridge. Further, work force changes were becoming increasingly driven by project completion and mission shift concerns -- with changes in skills mix factors increasing, gross reductions were less significant. Finally, opportunities for continued voluntary separations programs diminished. Skills mix requirements demanded better targeting in separation actions and participation levels declined as a result of repeated offerings over the past several years.



Also, Congress has also directed that “enhanced benefits” can only be funded through the Worker and Community Transition account.

All these changes provided the impetus to move to a new approach for work force restructuring for the Fiscal Year 1997 and 1998 separations. The Office of Worker and Community Transition has been managing the restructuring efforts to meet these changes and implement the new approach. One of the more significant changes is a move to a single work force restructuring plan for each site, which will remain in place to cover restructuring requirements as they occur. This plan can be amended as necessary, and allows stakeholder consultation prior to and during restructuring implementation. In addition, the new approach provides greater flexibility and responsibility for Department field offices and contractors. For example: implementing an ongoing plan requires headquarters notification, as opposed to their approval; requests to fund enhanced benefits will be reviewed in a more expeditious fashion; and work force management can be used as a performance measure for contract incentives. Further, incentives are now targeted to program requirements (to promote retention as needed, particularly at closure sites), and restructuring efforts are better coordinated with community transition efforts.

Mr. Bob Card, President and CEO of Kaiser-Hill Company (KHC), described some work force restructuring issues, particularly associated with the goal of closing Rocky Flats by the year 2006. The project’s elements needed to meet the goal include: 1) returning the site to reuse or open spaces; 2) demolishing 700 structures; 3) remediating or closing 200 environmental sites; 4) recovering and shipping plutonium and uranium liquids, special nuclear material, transuranic waste and low level wastes; 5) disposing of 150,000 containers of chemicals; 6) disposing of 1 million items of property, and 7) restructuring approximately 5,500 jobs. He stated that as a closure site, Rocky Flats presents some unique and challenging concerns for work force restructuring. In order to make closure in the year 2006 a reality, KHC needs to:

- tailor the work force size and skills mix commensurate with the project cash flows and performance needs;
- motivate the work force to engage in an accelerated closure effort and remain at the site until their services are no longer needed;
- achieve a level of work force safety, compliance and performance consistent with industry standards;
- minimize cost and schedule, as well as work force and community impacts; and,
- operate the complex like a commercial model -- first to market with experience and technologies.

Mr. Card noted that the DOE approach to restructuring still needed some improvements to meet adequately the needs of the sites. Faster approvals and more flexibility for complying with section 3161 for the contractors is necessary. One concern identified by Mr. Card is that all sites be



treated as if they were all the same. This is ineffective since many sites have unique social and political considerations that should be taken into account. At Rocky Flats, they are still treated like everyone else, but in reality they are different than other sites (e.g., there is low unemployment in the area and the surrounding community is not supportive). Continued DOE involvement in contractor personnel issues is not effective. DOE should not be micro-managing work force issues; it establishes rewards and penalties for contractor behavior, then leaves the management of those issues to the contractor. Another concern is that section 3161 still creates two classes of employees (cold war workers and non-cold war workers), making it even more difficult for the contractor to handle restructuring actions effectively.

Mr. Card also identified several management strategies designed to support the site's restructuring focus, including strategies associated with labor relations issues, enhancing employability, and softening the transition at the end of closure. Labor relation strategies include restructuring bargaining agreements to remove drivers for reduced employment, addressing jurisdictional agreements between bargaining units, establishing a steady (as opposed to fluctuating up or down) operating union employment, and upgrading first line supervisors. Strategies for enhancing employability include making it a positive feature to have Rocky Flats experience on your resume (as opposed to an inhibitor for future employment), outsourcing to lower tier contractors, and establishing commercially competitive compensation for employees.

Finally, Mr. Card described some of the progress to date at Rocky Flats regarding work force issues, including:

- a percentage increase in hourly workers since 1995 (i.e., the employees actually doing the closure work);
- a decrease in radiological violations;
- improved productivity (i.e., an increase in sites dispositioned and waste disposal versus a declining budget);
- outsourcing key functions (e.g., analytical laboratories, chemical management, engineering services and road and ground services); and
- positioned other functions for transition (e.g., occupational medicine and the fire department).

Along with this progress are several outstanding issues to be addressed. The more salient include:

- motivating personnel to save the government money at their expense (e.g., possibly offering end of project termination benefits);
- improving the ability to change the performance/competency mix;
- eliminating the class division and management preference in section 3161; and
- dealing with the year 2002-2004 transition from steel workers to building trades.



QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q: I haven't really seen much flexibility in downsizing. Who gets the enhanced benefits (at Oak Ridge for instance)?

A: (Terry Freese) Regarding flexibility, we're trying to meet particular circumstances at each site -- recognizing site-specific considerations. At Oak Ridge, for example, we were involved in the new Request-for-Proposal for the Management and Integrating contract to identify issues such as multiple employer pension plans (to address continuity issues) and make sure service credit continued, as well as other worker-related concerns. At Rocky Flats there was a different approach, including incrementally working tasks through outsourcing. Several options are considered. Someone might take the voluntary separation package (get enhanced severance) then opt for employment with DOE. Another option is to be involuntarily separated, get severance, then go to the new contractor through preference-in-hiring.

As far as who decides what the enhanced benefits are, it's based on the work force restructuring guidance, and ultimately the decision is for the OWCT. We must manage our budget between a number of competing demands.

As far as the two classes of workers are concerned, the program has historically been very embedded in the idea that we are rewarding cold war workers. We're saying now that work force restructuring is an ongoing process, and not just related to cold war workers -- only preference-in-hiring is still tied to the end of the cold war (September 27, 1991 for the purposes of our program).

Q: At Rocky Flats, the concept of work force management as a performance measure worked well initially, but now it's gone. It makes a big difference if it's part of the performance measure bonus calculation. Also, Bob, what did you mean by wanting DOE to distance itself from the work force management?

A: (Bob Card) No other large Federal program has this level of involvement in work force management. We want more control, we want to be in charge of our own work force - just like the private sector.

Q: DOE never formally sat at the table in labor-management relations -- but was close behind the scenes. There are areas where DOE is very needed, for example, in the continuity of health benefits.



A: (Bob Card) On the issue of retirees, yes, DOE needs to be involved. I'm talking about the management of current workers at the sites. We're very interested in the portability of health benefits.

(Terry Freese) DOE is currently looking at a catastrophic illness program possibility, particularly if there is a gap in coverage. A big issue for DOE is the potential multi-billion dollar medical liability for retirees down the road.

Q: There have been radical improvements at Rocky Flats since KHC came in. We are getting closer to commensurate salary levels and the increase in hourly workers is a good sign. But several issues are still outstanding. We need to ramp up the number of people needed to meet the year 2006 closure date. We have a shortage of critical skills folks -- we need apprenticeship programs to meet these needs. We should spend the money to train in-house as opposed to spending dollars just for separations. Also, I don't really agree with the date for the transition from the steel workers to the building trades, especially for the more contaminated buildings.

A: (Terry Freese) We do encourage the use of funding for training and internal placement.

(Bob Card) I agree that looking at an apprenticeship program is a good idea.

Q: Is Portsmouth covered under section 3161?

A: (Terry Freese) We have made funding available to Portsmouth prior to this year. The new legislation may affect that, but we're funding it. Our ability to continue funding does depend on Fiscal Year 1999 budgets.

3B. ASSET DISPOSITION PILOT PROJECTS

Moderator: Rich Aiken, Office of Worker and Community Transition

Speakers: Stuart Fribush, Coopers and Lybrand

Tom Lukow, Rocky Flats Field Office, U.S. Department of Energy

Lawrence Young, Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee

The central theme of these projects is to provide a mechanism to leverage unneeded Department of Energy (DOE) assets as a means to reduce mortgage costs. This session focused on solutions, rather than problems, using specific examples of viable opportunities, which were applied to current asset disposition projects.



Previous studies have cited the DOE's inventory of excess assets, which have been accumulating over many decades, as a major problem. There are costs associated for maintaining unneeded assets, even though in the current DOE accounting system they may not be very visible. Not only is there the obvious additional cost of merely maintaining the unneeded properties, but there also exists the potential for "down-stream" liability. Good cost savings figures, which could be used to better incentivize, are still lacking. The Office of Worker and Community Transition is considering funding a study to better identify and monitor such costs.

To help address these issues, the Department put forth "pilot" legislation to address costs, and instituted an integrated policy on property disposals. Section 3138 of the 1998 National Defense Authorization Act implemented the asset management pilot program. This program identifies six pilot projects located at four DOE Field/Operations Offices -- Oak Ridge (Tennessee), Richland (Washington), Rocky Flats (Colorado), Savannah River (South Carolina), and allows for revenue retention to offset program costs of property dispositioning. The pilot projects basically delve into three specific areas: leasing of facilities, electronics recycling, and selling unneeded assets. Although the primary goal of the pilot program is to reduce Departmental mortgage costs, this program also helps with economic diversification as a means to that end.

Correct policies, proper authorizations, appropriate scheduling, as well as creative ideas are all needed for asset disposition projects to succeed. There also needs to be more thinking outside one's immediate environment, that is, outside the proverbial "box". Knowing about opportunities is one thing, but one must also take advantage of available tools (e.g., sale/leasing authority, cost reimbursement, local expertise). Two examples of innovative use of tools within DOE are economic development mechanisms applied in the reindustrialization efforts at Oak Ridge, and the creative processes used in personal property disposal at Rocky Flats.

The first speaker was Stuart Fribush of Coopers and Lyband, who stated that asset management can no longer be approached as a support function to an operating site. Rather, it should be a core function which needs to be better aligned with evolving missions. As an example, in the environmental cleanup area, equipment must first be removed from those areas requiring D&D (decontamination & decommission) work. Embedded in the asset management philosophy is a "life cycle" issue, or idea that is finally coming to fore.

The concept of strategic asset management embodies certain characteristics. Primary elements focus on creating incentives as a means to align asset management with mission, considering the different asset types (e.g., personal property, real property, nuclear materials, intellectual property) synergistically (i.e., benefits that could be derived by putting things together as a "package"), and realizing that while it may begin as a site-specific activity (with the site being the lead), it follows a bottom-up approach and eventually becomes a Department-wide corporate function. Several examples of incentives include revenue retention from sales which would be



used for additional mission-related activities, potential to mine value of underlying assets (e.g., nickel found at an Oak Ridge facility during D&D efforts), and the potential for significant benefits for site transition or regional reindustrialization as a means to incentivize environmental cleanup activities.

There are benefits to viewing asset management strategically: creation of incentives for mission completion (e.g., reindustrialization); reduction of life-cycle costs and liabilities; capturing the value of underutilized assets; better alignment of multiple objectives (e.g., Environmental Management's cleanup function and support of worker and community transition activities). Examples include the efficient cleanup and reindustrialization of the former K-25 Site at Oak Ridge (now known as the East Tennessee Technology Park) by leveraging existing physical assets and emerging intellectual property; multi-site business centers for specialized assets to generate revenue and lessen costs (this is especially prominent for personal property and is evident with the precious metals center also in Oak Ridge); and new markets for isotopes developed and supported in industry and health care (e.g., food irradiation, radiopharmaceuticals) using DOE physical assets, intellectual property, and human resources.

Some barriers to efficient asset management include: lack of incentive for disposition (e.g., there is little incentive to declare assets unneeded, high environmental/national security transaction costs, and revenues generated are returned to the U.S. Treasury without covering DOE transaction costs); lack of incentive to avoid costs; lack of corporate business systems; fragmented statutory authorities for asset disposition; and the mentality of keeping unneeded assets "just in case" they might be required at a later date.

To overcome these barriers there needs to be a linkage of asset management with mission (site-specific concept with corporate Headquarter's support), a clear DOE-wide corporate policy on the use of existing statutory authorities and public/private partnerships, an entrepreneurial government process (cross-cutting business centers for certain categories of assets when business case exists), and creating synergy between various categories of assets. The Department needs to move away from its ingrained corporate thinking of "this is the way we've always done it".

There was a brief discussion of several public-private partnerships from other Federal agencies and their various activities. Included were the Department of Defense: Reuse of Proceeds from Surplus Real Property Sales (authority since 1991); Housing Revitalization Programs (Corpus Christi, Texas and Everett, Washington); Energy Initiatives (compensation for "avoided" energy expenses); Department of Transportation (State Infrastructure Banks); NASA (Commercial Technology Management System); USDA (Alternative Research and Commercialization Corporation). The partnerships listed above are successful examples of the entrepreneurial government approach, and serve as precedents for DOE efficiency-enhancing initiatives similar to Section 3140 of the Fiscal Year 1998 Defense Authorization Act.



The disposition process for real property was discussed. The lack of statutory authorities and interpretations of existing statutory authorities have led to more public-private partnerships, including limited liability corporations (LLC). The basic concept of a LLC is to foster a broader cooperation between DOE and the community reuse organizations. Through a LLC, the property is transferred to a local entity with DOE as a limited partner, while limiting the local entity's environmental liability. DOE would use the net lease revenues received to invest in mission areas.

Mr. Fribush suggested that the Department should consider the establishment of business centers for the management and disposition of personal property. Unlike real property, personal property management does not have to be site-specific. Complex-wide business centers could take advantage of economies of scale and special market-specific expertise to reduce carrying costs as well as generate revenue. Examples of business centers include DOE precious metals, DOE isotopes program, and the DoD Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service. The disposition of personal property is most effective when coordinated with the disposition of intellectual property and real property (e.g., fully-functional buildings available for reuse and incorporation of DOE technologies).

Intellectual property assets represent assets of the future and will likely be a significant force for attracting new life (e.g., food irradiation, radiopharmaceuticals, inorganic membrane technology commercialization), and hence incentivize cleanup operations. The potential for commercializing DOE intellectual property is great: 30 DOE labs maintain a staff of nearly 60,000 with an operating budget of about \$7.5 billion. Every year, about 500 licenses are awarded for technologies that are developed in these labs.

The next speaker, Mr. Lawrence Young, Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee, stated that there are currently 11 Community Reuse Organizations (CROs) across the DOE complex. The CROs were created to assist with property transfers and to better package assets, that used to be liabilities, to create jobs and job opportunities. The ultimate goal of the CROs is to work with the private sector to create jobs.

The Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee (CROET) was created to lease Federally owned properties and sublease them to private industry. Mechanisms used by CROET include bartering (e.g., use of equipment/facilities in exchange for cleanup services), providing short-term markets for recycled materials, and traditional leases.

Leasing/subleasing is a reindustrialization tool utilized to cost effectively accelerate and integrate environmental restoration and facility reuse. Reindustrialization is an economic boon for a community with many good paying jobs being created. As of the end of April 1998, reindustrialization efforts in the Oak Ridge area accounted for over 370 new jobs being created with more than \$15 million in annual wages (average wage for a new job was \$41,293).



The main area of the East Tennessee Technology Park (formerly known as the K-25 Site) contains about 1,500 acres, with slightly more than half of this acreage within a security fence. There are approximately 125 major buildings with more than 13 million sq. ft. of floor space. These are not just empty buildings, but in many instances buildings which are functional operating facilities containing specialized equipment. Currently available major facilities include K-1401 and K-1037. The K-1401 Maintenance Building has 473,000 sq. ft. of space; high bay facilities; precision machining capabilities, with over 400 major machine tools; and a main machine shop that can lift/manipulate 46 ton, 12ft. diameter pieces. The K-1037 Production-Development Facility with 334,000 sq. ft. of space has metallography and material test capabilities, as well as a stress laboratory; a railroad spur at a large loading dock; and a 17.5 MW uninterruptible power source. There are also 26 miles of paved roads and almost 10 miles of railroad tracks. Also, not to be overlooked, is the fact that this area is home to a highly skilled work force.

During the last two years, the East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP) has acquired 14 tenants. As of April 1998, the tenants included American Technologies, Inc.; Blue Ridge Development; Cook Heat and Air; Diversified Environmental Services; East Tennessee Materials and Energy Corp.; GLR Corp.; Infrared Technologies; Machine Kinetics Corp.; Materials and Chemistry Laboratory; Operations Management International; Southern Freight Logistics; Strip Technologies of America; TRISM Environmental Services; and VasCon Foundation.

Also mentioned was specific information regarding several of the ETTP tenants. American Technologies has leased a facility already equipped with machinery for its activities; and Infrared Technologies, Inc. which specializes in applying infrared technologies to heat and process metals, plastics, and ceramics, is leasing about 5,000 sq. ft. of space in Building K-1401 to manufacture specially designed infrared heating systems.

The final speaker, Tom Lukow from the Department of Energy's Rocky Flats Field Office, stated that Rocky Flats, a former nuclear weapons site, is currently under a closure phase; which is anticipated by the year 2006. Objectives during this phase include the expeditious disposal of property; removal of procedural and regulatory barriers; increased efficiency and achieving an economic balance between waste determination, reutilization, and sales.

The Rocky Flats Field Office has the realistic expectation that many items screened will not be reused, and that it would not be cost effective to do a 100 percent survey/release for most of the personal property items. Approximately 1 million personal property items need to be dispositioned by the year 2006, at a rate of 150,000 items per year to meet the closure schedule. Screening items helps to locate homes in (DOE facilities, schools, other public agencies) for approximately 6% of the excess property, with the remaining 94% being sold to the public. The personal property sold to the public is generally comprised of small, low-value items. In fiscal year 1998, approximately 40,000 pieces of equipment have been disposed. Increasing the



effectiveness of current disposal procedures is critical: Rocky Flats is looking to reengineer old processes and establish new procedures. The Rocky Flats Field Office is concentrating on high value items that are pretty much "ready to go", and is establishing an excess property central processing center to facilitate disposal. In addition, the Rocky Flats Field Office is developing economic disposition plans to plot the appropriate disposition path for the different classes and categories of equipment.

An economic disposition plan would typically involve the sorting of property into selected categories, conducting field assessments using mobile multi-functional teams, and making a determination if the property could be free released (taking into account nuclear proliferation and classification concerns). The disposal team then develops readiness and removal cost data (including decontamination, dismantlement, repair, and packaging costs), and compares disposal costs to the property's fair market value to decide whether to release the property for reuse or dispose it as waste. Due to its limited budget and schedule for property disposal, the Rocky Flats Field Office cannot transfer equipment desired by other DOE sites without reimbursement for packaging and shipping costs. Other DOE sites are asked to pay the Rocky Flats Field Office for the costs of transferring requested high value property to their locations.

Also discussed was the asset management pilot project at Rocky Flats. The National Defense Authorization Act for FY 1998 authorized the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site to retain revenues from the sale, lease, or disposal of personal property to offset the program costs of property disposition. Typical revenue streams could include public auctions; sealed bid sales; retail sales; scrap sales; Rocky Flats Local Impacts Initiative sales (the Rocky Flats Community Reuse Organization); and recovery of costs for transferring items for other Federal agency use. Typical program costs could include such items as priority utilization and disposal (e.g., economic disposition planning, reclamation, staging/warehousing); management and planning (e.g., distribution to projects). Net proceeds for the first half of fiscal year 1998 totaled \$242,786; with the largest component of \$92,041 (or nearly 40%) the result of the public auction mechanism.

Basic rules governing the reutilization and disposal of property date back to the Government Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. Even with subsequent Executive Orders and Public Laws modifying the process, the intent of the law has been to use excess property as the first source of supply, and to allocate available property within a hierarchy regardless of cost or cycle time. The intent of this process conflicts with the Site closure mission. On May 29, 1998, the RFFO Manager informed DOE/HQ that Section 161 (g) of the Atomic Energy Act would be implemented at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site. Section 161 (g) would enable property disposition to be conducted on an expedited basis, thereby reducing the cost of disposal activities and allowing the Site to focus on high value property in good condition. Moreover, the use of Section 161 (g) authority permits the Site to buy-down its infrastructure costs by mitigating or eliminating the property management function within some site facilities.



LUNCH PLENARY PRESENTATION

HARNESSING THE CONTRACTOR PROCESS TO ENCOURAGE LOCAL GROWTH

**Speaker: Thomas A. Garcia, Deputy Director for Institutional Development,
Los Alamos National Laboratory**

This session reviewed economic development initiatives instituted by the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). It was presented by Tom Garcia, LANL Deputy Director for Institutional Development.

Among the elements covered in this session were a general background on LANL's mission and role in the community; the laboratory's economic development program goals; the initiatives introduced to achieve those goals; some examples of substantive results; and the impacts of these efforts on the regional community.

Mr. Garcia's presentation began with a brief background on the laboratory, whose mission includes stockpile stewardship, non- and counter-proliferation, and environmental restoration. He discussed the role of the laboratory in the development of Los Alamos and the Northern New Mexico economy and community. He noted, for example, that although LANL accounts for 30% of the local economy — an annual impact of \$3.85 billion — the site had no history of philanthropic involvement in the Los Alamos community.

Philanthropic participation is one of four LANL economic development goals. The other three are job creation, significant regional investment, and diversifying the local economy. To achieve these goals, LANL has implemented economic development efforts aimed at:

- Increasing the public sector market share;
- Growing the industrial and private sector market share;
- Leveraging the laboratory's sub-contractors; and,
- Infrastructure revitalization.

From 1998-2003, Mr. Garcia expects that LANL will engage in more than \$1.2 billion worth of Federal construction programs for the laboratory's stockpile stewardship, stockpile management, and non-proliferation activities. The laboratory has also formed commercial partnerships which include such private firms as US West, Motorola, TRU, and Xerox, all in an effort to expand LANL's industrial and private sector market share.



The budget for these collaborations was \$10 million in 1996, and \$78 million in 1997. Public and private partnerships such as these are the product of the laboratory's concerted efforts to promote outside investment into the local economy. Mr. Garcia noted, for example, that the US West Service Center is estimated to produce a regional economic impact of \$11.25 million a year or \$56.24 million over the next 5 years.

Last year, through their Technology Commercialization Office, LANL budgeted \$78 million for public and private sector market expansion activities, including the 1999 leasing of 50 Department of Energy acres to Los Alamos County for construction of a Research Park that will be managed by the Los Alamos Economic Development Council. The first 50,000 square foot building in the complex will be occupied by Motorola.

By re-competing their largest sub-contracts (worth \$704 million), Mr. Garcia stated that LANL is able to apply leverage to these sub-contractors to include stipulations covering such items as local hiring, economic diversification, local community investment, and a 25% WMBE requirement. Benefits for the sub-contractor are derived through reduced cycle-time (an annual savings of between 10% and 15%), and other economic incentives offered by LANL.

Mr. Garcia identified some early examples of LANL's economic development efforts, including the locating of offices or plants in northern New Mexico by:

- Fluor Daniel, Inc. -- Architects/Engineers, 100 to 150 jobs (Española);
- Johnson Controls of Northern New Mexico, Inc. -- 600 to 1100 jobs (Española);
- Protection Technology Los Alamos, Inc. [PTLA – 100 new jobs and an \$11.95 million total regional impact]; and
- Burns & Roe, Inc. -- Architects/Engineers, 50-60 jobs (Los Alamos).

LANL estimates that its economic development initiatives will create 5,700 new jobs in New Mexico between 1997 and 2001. Of those, 83% (4,700) will be in northern New Mexico. Through LANL's Procurement Initiative, formed by the Northern New Mexico Procurement Advisory Committee and the Strategic Learning Systems Partnerships, regional procurement increased by \$50 million (or 22%) to \$274.3 million in fiscal year 1997.

Mr. Garcia's economic development office also works hand-in-hand with the public/private Los Alamos National Laboratory Foundation. The Foundation promotes educational enrichment (through an alliance with the Tri-County Higher Education Association and the Northern New Mexico Council for Excellence in Education), economic development, and accessibility to social services.



The total 1998 LANL grants to the Foundation totaled \$1.75 million. Other commitments to the Foundation, which will come from the University of California, an annual fund-raiser, and public, private, and matching grants, will average \$8 million a year or \$40 million over the next 5 years.

Mr. Garcia concluded his presentation by recognizing his LANL colleagues who have worked with him on these and other economic development efforts. He circulated contact names and phone numbers for various personnel responsible for community outreach and economic development.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS - CONCURRENT SESSION 4

4A. LABOR MANAGEMENT FORUM

Moderator: Barry R. Lawson, President, Lawson Associates

Speakers: John F. Meese, Metal Trades Department, AFL-CIO

John Bradburne, Fluor Daniel Fernald

Gene Branham, Fernald Atomic Trades & Labor Council

Greg Glynn, Bechtel Nevada

Dave Garbarino, International Union of Operating Engineers,
Local 12

Lavonne C. Ritter, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service
Region

This session was organized to communicate the experiences of labor and management representatives during collective bargaining negotiations at Department of Energy sites in Ohio and Nevada. The session was divided into two panels with union and management negotiators from the Fernald Environmental Management Project in Ohio, and the Southern Nevada Labor Alliance in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Among the elements presented during this forum were discussions on the use of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FMCS) to facilitate labor negotiations and examples of various methods to developing productive and credible labor-management relationships.

Panel 1: Fernald Environmental Management Project

Title: "Spirit of Collaboration"

Participants: John Meese, Metal Trades Department, AFL-CIO

John Bradburne, Fluor Daniel Fernald

Gene Branham, Fernald Atomic Trades and Labor Council



John Meese, President of the Metal Trades Department, AFL-CIO opened the session with remarks on the dynamics of good labor-management partnerships, his perspective on the state of labor relations in the United States and the history of the Department of Energy's role in promoting productive labor-management relationships. Mr. Meese also presented his views on the recent privatization efforts, noting that the Department should take into account a greater diversity of views on the issue. He noted that while there are many positive aspects to reform, the Department should not lose sight of the policy impact on the individual worker.

John Bradburne, President, Fluor Daniel Fernald and Gene Branham, Fernald, Atomic Trades and Labor Council discussed the 1998-2003 agreement between Fluor Daniel Fernald and the Fernald Atomic Trades and Labor Council (FAT&LC). Together, Fluor Daniel Fernald and FAT&LC were able to develop a contract that satisfied the dual goals of maintaining necessary skills for project completion, while preparing those who have fulfilled their roles at Fernald for employment elsewhere.

Through enhanced work planning, FAT&LC members are equal partners in the planning and execution of work on site. This partnership has resulted in dramatic improvements in safety, efficiency, and cost-savings for projects of all sizes and scope.

The career development opportunities in place at Fernald are unequalled anywhere in the DOE complex. The site has two full-service Career Development Centers staffed with professional career counselors.

Through a working labor-management partnership, Fernald has implemented innovative programs that expand team members' options. These include:

- Commercial Driver's License Training Program;
- CSX Training Program;
- Fluor Daniel Craft Certification Program; and the
- Craft Apprenticeship Program.

Fluor Daniel Fernald and FAT&LC are committed to providing development opportunities to team members that will enable them to leave Fernald employed.

The panel credited the tremendous progress they are making on cleaning up the Fernald site to the collaborative relationship Fluor Daniel Fernald and FAT&LC have been able to achieve.

Panel 2: Southern Nevada Labor Alliance
Title: "Labor-Management Partnerships -- Innovative Approaches"
Participants: Greg Glynn, Bechtel Nevada Labor Relations Director



Dave Garbarino, International Operating Engineers Local 12
Lavonne C. Ritter, Federal Mediation & Conciliation Service

Dave Garbarino, Greg Glynn, and Lavonne Ritter delivered a joint presentation on their experiences in creating the Southern Nevada Labor Alliance (SNLA), a “partnership to promote labor and management cooperation based on trust and teamwork.”

Early in their bidding process to operate the site, the contractor, Bechtel Nevada, informed the Department of Energy that they would be creating an alliance with the union. Mr. Garbarino, International Operating Engineers Local 12, agreed that the Bechtel Nevada takeover of the site was crucial to forming the successful type of labor-management relationship that now exists.

The agreement and alliance was made possible through, first and most importantly, union leadership and ‘buy-in.’ The union had to not only agree to work through the process, but take an active, leading role in it. Second, management support of the effort. The contractor’s support was crucial to ensuring a credible and enduring partnership. Third, agreed upon and understandable goals had to be established. Finally, both sides had to work together on developing a plan on how to reach those goals.

Parties participated in a “Team Building Skills Training” provided by the FMCS. The training focused on the consensus/decision-making process and emphasized listening and communications skills. Meetings between labor and management were facilitated by the FMCS and observed by Department of Energy representatives. Through this process, a mission statement for the continuous improvement processes were established.

Areas for improvement were jointly determined through the establishment of various committees, including the first two committees formed: the Craft Work Rules and Jurisdictional Work Assignments. The latter Continuous Improvement (CI) Committee was formed to address a 40-year ongoing problem for the site. CI Committees and members were identified and established. Through this process, workers were able to participate in the decision-making process, thus making them feel a part of the system and creating a more accommodating work environment.

The foundation for the negotiations were set through a process of “Interest-Based Bargaining” (IBB) with FMCS providing training and facilitation. After 40 years and 31 individual labor agreements, there was consensus to consolidate boilerplate language for 16 construction unions and nine maintenance unions.

The “Work Rules” and a “Dispute Resolution Process,” developed by the labor-management Continuous Improvement committees, were incorporated into Agreements as were principles of the SNLA.



In conclusion, the panel discussed the following points to ensure reaching an agreement:

- FMCS Facilitation (where necessary)
- Skills Training (Joint Labor-management)
- Union Leadership
- Management Support
- Time and Patience
- Trust and Teamwork

In all, the formation of the SNLA and the resulting Agreements encompassed 110 negotiating sessions over a nine-month period.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q: How did you work through the issues surrounding jurisdictional work assignments?

A: A pre-job conference, involving all parties, was established as a critical part of the process. At this pre-job conference, work is assigned to the various crafts. If, after that conference, there is still a dispute between or among the crafts with respect to work jurisdiction, that dispute is submitted to a panel composed of three representatives from disinterested crafts. These representatives hear the case and assess the dispute based on eight specific criteria agreed to by the parties. The panel then renders, in writing, a final and binding decision on which craft does the work.

4B. COMMUNITY TRANSITION: PROPERTY POLICY

Moderator: Debby Swichkow, Office of Worker and Community Transition, U.S. Department of Energy

Speakers: Jim Woolford, Environmental Protection Agency
Bob Rosselli, Richland Operations Office
Ben Bennett, Port of Benton
Robert Brown, Oak Ridge Operations Office

Debby Swichkow, Deputy Director, Office of worker and Community Transition introduced the topic and the various aspects to be addressed during the session. Transfers under both the Hall Amendment and the Atomic Energy Act would be examined. The role of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) would be discussed. Speakers would also include examples of transfer and re-use activities. Ms. Swichkow also provided a general overview of the property transfer efforts within the Department of Energy (DOE). She indicated that a joint policy with EPA that establishes procedures for consultation and concurrence was to be completed soon.



Jim Woolford of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Office, provided comments about the coordination between the DOE and EPA. He explained that EPA had been heavily involved in property transfer for the last four to five years. Because DOE property is frequently contaminated, EPA has a role in the property transfer under the provisions of CERCLA. The EPA also becomes closely involved during the use of the Hall Amendment because EPA concurrence is required before the transfer may occur.

The use of the Hall Amendment has been tried at several sites with varied results. Through both the DOE's and EPA's experiences, a standard process has been developed. The overall intention has been to promote reuse, including the reuse of "brown" facilities. At the same time, reuse must be compatible with protection of human health and the environment. The EPA can assist in achieving reuse of facilities but can provide the best assistance only if involved early in the process. Mr. Woolford also invited participants to visit the web site for his office. The address of that site is: **www.epa.gov/swerffr**.

The next speaker, Bob Rosselli, Richland, provided a federal viewpoint. He first recognized the contribution that reused Federal assets could make to local economic development. He also mentioned how, through communication, timely action, and flexibility, all parties involved in asset transfers can form a partnership to accomplish their respective goals.

Mr. Rosselli next examined the different kinds of reuses, i.e., disposals, leases, and licenses. Examples of disposals included industrial facilities transferred to the Port of Benton and the pending transfer of several buildings. Specific equipment has also been disposed of or is presently being processed for disposal including more than 100 pieces of equipment that have aided community development and an extrusion press for aluminum manufacturing. This latter piece of equipment will result in the development of new jobs as it is placed in commercial operation.

He next provided samples of leases and the authorities used to lease the facilities. The leased facilities have included both research and development buildings, industrial processing facilities, and facilities that will help the Port of Benton with its industrial development. The Operations Office has estimated that the life cycle cumulative savings produced by leasing will be about \$800 million. An advantage of leasing is that the operations office has been able to complete the leases quickly and the reuse of existing facilities helps in trying to attract employers paying comparable wages to the workers affected by restructuring.

Licenses were the last topic in his presentation. The licenses are characteristic for under-utilized equipment or facilities. Unlike leases, they allow for dual use by both government and other users. Also, because they are for underutilized assets, the asset is not yet excess property subject to the GSA Property Leasing rules and they are still able to yield an additional return to the community.



The next speaker was Ben Bennett from the Port of Benton. He first provided some general information on the history of the Port of Benton. He provided examples of projects involving property transfers that have already occurred — some many years before the community transition program began. These included the Richland Airport and the Technology and Business Campus.

The Richland Airport was transferred in 1962 and was developed as initially planned with a variety of businesses, support facilities, and recreation facilities. The Technology and Business Campus (obtained in 1960) was originally planned for industrial park use, such as warehousing and railroad facilities. However, its actual development has made it a laboratory and business park that supports Battelle, the supply system, and DOE contractors. The new Advanced Processing Engineering Laboratory (APEL) has also located there.

New projects include the APEL facility mentioned above, which is integrating the resources of DOE, local governments, local development authorities, and private industry to build a technology based center for industry. The Port of Benton is also working on use of the Hanford Railway System. The Port envisions the existing facilities to be a catalyst not only to attract manufacturers interested in being located at a trans shipment point between rail and ship.

He concluded by pointing out the advantages in reusing existing facilities. Among the benefits cited were lower cleanup costs, preserving the assets as usable facilities for other uses, and changing the assets from a liability requiring federal maintenance to an asset producing taxable income.

The final speaker was Robert Brown of the Oak Ridge Operations Office. He addressed a major reuse effort of the Oak Ridge Complex which has been labeled “Reindustrialization.” As a part of this effort, the Department will be involved with the transfer of underutilized assets to accomplish some of the Department’s goals.

A key feature of the project is an innovative partnership between the Department and private industry. In this partnership, participating companies would be able to exchange use of underused DOE facilities for cleanup of the Oak Ridge facility. Such an exchange would accelerate the cleanup of the Oak Ridge facility at lower cost than if the Department contracted the performance of the task; although DOE would still have the responsibility to assure that the facilities are adequately cleaned. The indirect benefits are quicker conversion of DOE facilities to commercial use resulting in creation of jobs and generation of revenues.

In a discussion of a flow chart for a typical lease activity, the presentation repeated some of the findings of other speakers. The common principle these projects share with other sites is the need to have early involvement of regulators and other interested parties. In the sample flow chart,



after preliminary evaluations indicate that an opportunity exists, EPA is notified and the processes for environmental and other clearances are started.

Ms. Swichkow concluded by mentioning that the Department is developing internal Departmental guidance on property transfer. She pointed out that the DOE Field is responsible for documenting and justifying its transfer decisions. Abuse of authorities for expediency or other reasons could jeopardize the Department's continued ability to use that authority.

BRITISH EXPERIENCE IN ECONOMIC CONVERSION

Speaker: Tim Knowles, International Research & Graduate Centre, Westlakes Science & Technology Park, Great Britain

Tim Knowles, Director, International Research & Graduate Centre, Westlakes Science & Technology Park in Great Britain, provided a unique opportunity to discuss a successful and comprehensive partnership in West Cumbria, Great Britain, between private enterprise, local government, and community leaders. The overall aim of Westlakes Science & Technology Park is to bring academic and scientific research into successful union with commercial applications, and thereby foster economic rejuvenation and regeneration in West Cumbria. The result is a synergy between individuals, organizations and disciplines - a fusion of energy and ideas.

Mr. Knowles began his presentation with a historical perspective of the economy of West Cumbria between 1950 to 1990. Steel and coal were the dominate resources in the 1950's until they were replaced by the nuclear industry. The shipping, mining, steelmaking, metal goods production and railway activities, at their peak employed tens of thousands of individuals. With the demise of these industries, West Cumbria is a stark reminder of the need for economic diversity and the importance of not being too reliant on one industry, or group of associated industries.

He stated that the diversification of the West Cumbria economy was one of the main objectives of West Cumbria Partnership, which was formed in 1987. Its mission is to create an environment in which science and technology can be developed and exploited commercially and academically, in order to contribute to the economic regeneration and diversification of West Cumbria. Involved in this Partnership are the public and private sectors in the area, including British Nuclear Fuels Limited (BNFL), Allerdale and Copeland Borough Councils, Cumbria County Council, the Rural Development Commission and the local business community. The Partnership created a stakeholder strategy to address public concerns, loss of jobs, and the economic regeneration of West Cumbria. The success of this strategy relied on: 1) a recognition of importance of each stakeholders contribution to build a genuine appreciation of mutual needs; 2) to engage the whole community to create ownership.



The initial concept of a “science park” came from the United States, beginning in the 1950's with initiatives at Stanford, Boston and North Carolina. Mr. Knowles stated that the elements of successful science parks demonstrate that both large and small firms have a role to play in the innovation process. The costs and techniques that need to be employed to innovate a new product, material or process, are often so demanding of resources (and the payback so uncertain) that it is only the large firm that has ability to devote sufficient resources to undertake applied research which may lead to their development. Small firms, however, are also often involved in the diffusion of innovations in the market place. Flexible and adaptable, they are often well placed to identify customer needs and move rapidly to develop an innovation into a profitable market niche.

He continued to state that science parks, then, involve a nexus between science and the market for technology-based high value-added products. They provide an environment for the creation of firms based on new technology which, embodying technologies of the future, may offer secure high quality jobs, in commercially sound areas. With technologies increasingly depending on pure and applied science, science park environments (close to that science) will come to play an increasingly important role in the development of high value-added products.

In addition, Mr. Knowles continued, it has been recognized that there are other problems in creating the right conditions for stimulating the West Cumbrian economy. A particular problem is the narrow range of higher education facilities. The dearth of such facilities means that young West Cumbrians of high ability go elsewhere for their education and many do not return to the area. Because of this, the entrepreneurial culture found near many universities, which spins-off many small firms, simply does not happen in West Cumbria. In the past, there has been little opportunity for developing a constructive relationship between industry and graduates locally. Mr. Knowles stated that, as developments continue at Westlakes, a clear goal will be not only to link to its academic activities with the region's existing universities, but to integrate them into the concept of a multi-site university within Cumbria.

As of the Spring 1996, there are four major developments on the Westlakes site: the Geoffrey Schofield Laboratories; the conversion of the Ingwell House and its extension in two phases; the Westlakes Research Institute; and the building of the International Research and Graduate Centre. The major successes of the Partnership and the Westlakes Park are:

- In the past 10 years, the Partnership has created or safe guarded approximately 3,500 jobs;
- 26 companies at Westlakes Park;
- over 350 people employed at the Park with a target of 1,000 employed by 2003;
- \$35 million capital funding since 1991 of which \$8 million is European funding (funding target was \$20 million);
- business survival rate in West Cumbria 15% above national average;



- placed in the Top 6 ERDF funded research and development success stories in Europe;
- experience in economic regeneration being applied internationally, specifically in the Ukraine and Chernobyl.

In conclusion, Mr. Knowles stated that the key to economic conversion in dependency economies is the development of comprehensive and creative partnerships between stakeholders. Innovation, focus, commitment, creativity, mutual support and ownership are all hallmarks of the successful and winning partnerships and they can and do deliver jobs, prosperity and hope for communities and provide a win-win solution for government and business.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q: What was the number of workers at the plant?

A: Employment went from 16,000 to 9,000.



APPENDIX A FINAL PARTICIPANTS LIST

Mr. Bob Agonia

Program Manager, Contractor Human Resources
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518
Phone: 702-295-1005
Fax: 702-295-2367
E-mail: agonia@nv.doe.gov

Mr. Richard Aiken

Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
Room 8F-073/FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-0415
Fax: 202-586-1737

Mr. Robert C. (Bob) Allen

Vice President & Division Manager
Human Resources Programs & Services
Kaiser-Hill Company, LLC
Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site
P.O. Box 464
Golden, CO 80402-0464
Phone: 303-966-3395
Fax: 303-966-8121
E-mail: bob.kh_hr.allen@fets.gov

Mr. Juan Alvarez

Manager, Internal Audit, Assurance & Quality
Mason & Hanger Corporation
Pantex Plant Post Office Box 30020
Building 12-6
Amarillo, TX 79120-0020
Phone: 806-477-4055
Fax: 806-477-5930
E-mail: jalvarez@pantex.com

Ms. Courtney Anderson

Research Associate
Council for Urban Economic Development
1730 K Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
Phone: 202-223-4735
Fax: 202-223-4745
E-mail: canderson@urbandevelopment.co

Mr. Kenneth P. Armstrong

Manager, Site Transition
Babcock and Wilcox of Ohio
1 Mound Road
Maimisburg, OH 45343
Phone: 937-865-3395
Fax: 937-865-1351
E-mail: armskp@doe-md.gov

Mr. Harris Arthur

Senior Deputy Chief of Staff
Office of the President/Vice President
PO Box 9000
Window Rock, AZ 86515
Phone: 520-871-7008
Fax: 520-871-4025
E-mail: harthur@shiboy.nncs.his.gov

Mr. Lewis C. Attardo

Executive Director
Savannah River Regional
Diversification Initiative (SRRDI)
P O Box 696
Aiken, SC 29803
Phone: 803-593-9954x1409
Fax: 803-593-4296
E-mail: lewis.attardo@srrdi.org



Mr. Raymond Baca
Industrial Relations Specialist
Albuquerque Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 5400
Albuquerque, NM 87185-5400
Phone: 505-845-6274
Fax: 505-845-4715
E-mail: rbaca@doeal.gov

Ms. Cheri Bahrke
C2NET Coordinator
Science Applications International Corporation
2597 B Road
Grand Junction, CO 81503
Phone: 970-248-6038
Fax: 970-248-6040
E-mail: cbahrke@doegjpo.com

Ms. Marilyn Balcombe
Industrial Psychologist
Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education
Office of Worker & Community Transition
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-2023
Fax: 202-586-1540
E-mail: balcombm@oraogov

Mr. Bob Baney
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
Room 6G-063/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-3751
Fax: 202-586-1540

Mr. Robert J. Bardsley
Industrial Relations Officer
Idaho Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
850 Energy Drive
Idaho Falls, ID 83401-1563

Phone: 208-526-0688
Fax: 208-526-5969
E-mail: bardslrj@inel.gov

Ms. Dei Barney
Director, Staffing
Lockheed Martin Idaho
P.O. Box 1675
Idaho Falls, ID 83415
Phone: 208-526-8674
Fax: 208-526-0025
E-mail: dei@inel.gov

Ms. Eileen L. Beaulieu
Program Manager
Albuquerque Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 5400
Albuquerque, NM 87115
Phone: 505-845-4984
Fax: 505-845-4239
E-mail: ebeaulieu@doeal.gov

Mr. Ben Bennett
Executive Director
Port of Benton
3100 George Washington Way
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-375-3060
Fax: 509-375-5287
E-mail: pob@port-of-benton.com

Mr. Andy Bennett
Executive Committee
Paducah Area Community Reuse Organization
Post Office Box 588
Mayfield, KY 42066
Phone: 502-247-7171
Fax: 502-251-6110



E-mail: puradd@apex.net

Mr. Robert A. Bergin
Director, Human Resources
B&W Services, Inc.
Post Office Box 11165
Lynchburg, VA 24506
Phone: 804-522-6333
Fax: 804-522-6983
E-mail: robt.a.bergin@mcdermott.com

Mr. Leo Berroteran
President
Local Lodge 990 of IAMAW
Allied Signal Federal Manufacturing &
Technologies
P O Box 419159
Kansas City, MO 64141-6159
Phone: 816-997-3625
Fax: 816-997-3331

Mr. Toby C. Bickmore
Industrial Relations Specialist
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
PO Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518
Phone: 702-295-1012
Fax: 702-295-2367
E-mail: bickmore@nv.doe.gov

Mr. William J. Biloski
Facilities Reuse Manager
Bechtel Jacobs Company LLC
P.O. Box 4699
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-7169
Phone: 423-574-4182
Fax: 423-576-7536
E-mail: uzy@ornl.gov

Mr. Thomas A. Biscup
Director, Industrial Relations
Fluor Daniel Fernald

P.O. Box 538704, MS-15
Cincinnati, OH 45253-8704
Phone: 513-648-4884
Fax: 513-648-3777
E-mail: thomas_biscup@fernald.gov

Mr. Randy Blakelock
BDM Federal/TRW
4001 North Fairfax Drive
Suite 750
Arlington, VA 22203
Phone: 703-351-6967
Fax: 703-351-6909
E-mail: rblakelo@bdm.com

Mr. Jack Blanchard
Director, Asset Management
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
Room 6F-029/FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202/586-6703
Fax: 202/586-1737

Mr. Rick Blea
Business Representative
United Association of Plumbers and Steamfitters
Local Union No. 412
510 San Pedro, S.E.
Albuquerque, NM 87108
Phone: 505-265-1513
Fax: 505-265-7127

Ms. Sara Bobersky
Job Development Specialist
Star Access
3601 Eisenhower Avenue
Suite 450
Alexandria, VA 22304
Phone: 703-317-8873
Fax: 703-960-7007

Mr. David O. Bolling



Anderson County Executive
Anderson County Government
100 N. Main Street, Room 208
Clinton, TN 37716
Phone: 423-457-5400
Fax: 423-457-5491

Ms. April Bonet
Program Coordinator
StarAccess
3601 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22304
Phone: 703-960-7000
Fax: 703-960-7009
E-mail: abonet@staraccess.com

Mr. Raymond J. Borkowski
Vice President
Performance Plus International, Inc.
103 A Donner Drive
Oak Ridge, TN 37830
Phone: 423-425-0211
Fax: 423-425-0215
E-mail: rhk@icx.net

Mr. Leo Bowman
Chairman
Board of Benton County Commissioners
P.O. Box 190
Prosser, WA 99350
Phone: 509-786-5600
Fax: 509-786-5625
E-mail: carol_trippp@co.benton.wa.us

Mr. John Bradburne
President
Fluor Daniel Fernald, Inc.
PO Box 538704
Cincinnati, OH 45253-8704
Phone: 513-648-3311
Fax: 513-648-3601

Mr. Gene Branham

Vice President
Federal Atomic Trades and Labor Council
Fluor Daniel Fernald
P O Box 538704
Cincinnati, OH 45253
Phone: 513-648-5343
Fax: 513-648-3710

Mr. Robert L. Bray
Chairman
Joint Utilization Commission
1015 N 7th Street
Grand Junction, CO 81501
Phone: 970-242-3647
Fax: 970-242-0436

Mr. John Brock
Labor Relations Manager
Bechtel Jacobs
Post Office Box 4699
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-7113
Phone: 423-241-1201
Fax: 423-241-1425
E-mail: o93@ornl.gov

Mr. Lyle Brown
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1) Room 6G-057/FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-0431
Fax: 202-586-8403

Mr. Robert J. Brown, III
Oak Ridge Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
20 Administration Road
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Phone: 423-576-2599
Fax: 423-241-4439

Mr. James B. Bussell
Program Manager



East Tennessee Mechanical Contractors, Inc.
P O Box 4247
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Phone: 423-574-3054
Fax: 423-241-6304
E-mail: busselljb@ornl.gov

Mr. Matt Cain
Science Applications International Corporation
(SAIC)
901 D Street SW Suite 201
Washington, DC 20024
Phone: 202/488-6625
Fax: 202/488-3158
E-mail: thomas.m.cain@cpmx.saic.com

Mr. Allen R. Callaway
Financial Secretary
Fluor Daniel Fernald
P O Box 538704
Cincinnati, OH 45253
Phone: 513-648-5343
Fax: 513-648-3710

Mr. Bruce Campbell
Advisory Board Liaison
Mason & Hanger Corporation
701 South Taylor Street
Nations Bank Building, Suite 420
Amarillo, TX 79101
Phone: 806-372-4662
Fax: 806-372-4663

Mr. Jim Campbell
President
East Tennessee Economic Council
Post Office Box 5957
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Phone: 423-483-3047
Fax: 423-483-3062
E-mail: campbell@orcc.org

Mr. Bob Card

President
Kaiser-Hill Company, LLC
P O Box 464, Building 111
Golden, CO 80402-0464
Phone: 303-966-9870
Fax: 303-4998443

Mr. Tim Carlson
President and CEO
NTS Development Corporation
2340 Paseo del Prado, Suite D-108
Las Vegas, NV 89102
Phone: 702-257-7900
Fax: 702-257-7999
E-mail: tcarlson@ntsdev.com

Mr. John B. Carpenter
Team Leader
Personal Property Sales and Reuse
HR-53
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585
Phone: 202-586-4157
Fax: 202-586-0757
E-mail: john.b.carpenter@hq.doe.gov

Ms. Lisa B. Carter
Contractor Industrial Relations Specialist
Oak Ridge Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P O Box 2001, M/S - AD- 441
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-8791
Phone: 423-576-0141
Fax: 423-576-6964
E-mail: carterlb@oro.doe.gov

Mr. Tony Carter
Special Assistant
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1) Room 6G-041/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585



Phone: 202-586-3323
Fax: 202-586-1540
E-mail: tony.carter@hq.doe.gov

Mr. Manual "Skip" Castro
Field Liaison Officer
Office of Field Management (FM-10)
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW Room 1J-051/
FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-4937
Fax: 202-586-3933
E-mail: manuel.castro@hq.doe.gov

Mr. Thomas Cauthen
Contractor Industrial Relations Specialist
Savannah River Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Post Office Box 9
Aiken, SC 29802
Phone: 803-725-8044
Fax: 803-725-8573

Ms. Chee Chang
Program Manager
International Brotherhood of Teamsters Union
25 Louisiana Avenue N W
Washington, DC 20001
Phone: 202-624-6963
Fax: 202-624-8125
E-mail: chee328@aol.com

Mr. Michael Church
President
Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers
International Union, Local 3-288
Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Inc.
P.O. Box 2003
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-7113
Phone: 423-483-3745
Fax: 423-483-6460

The Honorable Richard C. Church
Mayor
Mayor, City of Miamisburg
10 North First Street
Miamisburg, OH 45342
Phone: 513-866-3303
Fax: 513-866-0891

Mr. John H. Clabaugh
Manager, Human Resources
AlliedSignal Inc. FM&T
P.O. Box 419159
Kansas City, MO 64141-6159
Phone: 816-997-5575
Fax: 816-997-7016
E-mail: jclabaugh@kcp.com

Mr. Dave Clark
Contractor Industrial Relations Specialist
Idaho Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
850 Energy Drive, MS-1152
Idaho Falls, ID 83401-2563
Phone: 208-526-6591
Fax: 208-526-5969
E-mail: clarkda@inel.gov

Mr. Herbert L. Coleman
UPGWA Local 330
2291 Busswood Drive
Augusta, GA 30906
Phone: 706-798-5932
Fax: 803-471-9592

Ms. Susan Connor
Program Manager
Albuquerque Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 5400 ETDD
Albuquerque, NM 87185-5400
Phone: 505-845-4345
Fax: 505-845-5960
E-mail: sconnor@doeal.gov



Mr. Tim Cooper
General Engineer
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
232 Energy Way
North Las Vegas, NV 89030
Phone: 702-295-2379
Fax: 702-295-1113
E-mail: cooper@nv.doe.gov

Mr. Ben D. Corder
Manager
Industrial Relations Administration & Oversight
Fluor Daniel Hanford
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-376-5205
Fax: 509-376-8697

Ms. Sharon C. Cornwell
Fernald Community Reuse Organization
P.O. Box 38
Ross, OH 45011
Phone: 513-648-4165
E-mail: sharon_cornwell@fernald.gov

Mr. Mark Coronado
Management Analyst
Richland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Management & Economic Transition Division P O
Box 550,
MSIN K8-50
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-372-4100
Fax: 509-372-4037
E-mail: mark_a_coronado@rl.gov

Mr. Dan Cudaback
President
Eastern Idaho Economic Development Council,
Inc.
683 North Capital Avenue
Idaho Falls, ID 83402

Phone: 208-522-2014
Fax: 208-522-3824
E-mail: eiedc-dc@srv.net

Ms. Sandy Davis
Labor Relations Manager
Bechtel Jacobs
Post Office Box 4699
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-7113
Phone: 423-574-8585
Fax: 423-241-1425
E-mail: sxd@ornl.gov

Mr. Brad Davis
Executive Committee
Paducah Area Community Reuse Organization
P.O. Box 588
Mayfield, KY 42066
Phone: 502-247-7171
Fax: 502-251-6110

Ms. Vicky L. Davis
Management Analyst, Public Affairs & Information
Office
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518
Phone: 702-295-2770
Fax: 702-295-5300

Mr. Mark Deathridge
President & CEO
East Tennessee Mechanical Contractors
109 Bertrand Street
Knoxville, TN 37917
Phone: 423-522-6108

Mr. Robert W. DeGrasse, Jr.
Director
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1) Room 6G-030/ FORS



Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-7550
Fax: 202-586-8403
E-mail: robert.degrasse@hq.doe.gov

Mr. Kirby Denslow
Work Force Planning Specialist
Battelle-Pacific Northwest Laboratory
K1-34 P.O. Box 999
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-375-6733
Fax: 509-375-6479
E-mail: kirby.denslow@pnl.gov

Mr. Thomas B. DePriest
Attorney-Advisor
Office of General Counsel
U.S. Department of Energy
(GC-51) Room 6A-113/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-2946
Fax: 202-586-7373
E-mail: thomas.depriest@hq.doe.gov

Mr. Don H. "Doc" DeTonancour
President
Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers
Local 2-652
510 Ruth Avenue
Idaho Falls, ID 83405
Phone: 208-529-4718
Fax: 208-524-9901

Ms. G. Leah Dever
Manager
Ohio Field Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Post Office Box 3020
Miamisburg, OH 45342
Phone: 937-865-3977
Fax: 937-865-3426

Ms. Anita L. Dever

Manager - Employment
Administrative Support
Lockheed Martin Utility Services, Inc.
P O Box 628, 3930 US Route 23 South
Piketon, OH 45661
Phone: 614-897-2615
Fax: 614-897-2984
E-mail: deveral@1mus.com

Mr. Paul Dickman
Special Assistant
Albuquerque Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 5400
Albuquerque, NM 87185
Phone: 505-845-4313
Fax: 505-845-5872
E-mail: pdickman@doeal.gov

Ms. Shelia Dillard
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1), 6F-029/FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202/586-1311
Fax: 202/586-1737
E-mail: shelia.dillard@hq.doe.gov

Ms. Cheryl L. Dinkins
Director, Administrative Services
Office of Worker and Community Services
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585
Phone: 202-586-7388
Fax: 202-586-1540

Mr. Lou Doll
Representative
Building Trades
Fluor Daniel Fernald
P.O. Box 538704
Cincinnati, OH 45253



Phone: 513-648-5343
Fax: 513-648-3710

Mr. Dana J. Dorr
Employee Relations and Staffing Manager
Kaiser-Hill Company, L.L.C.
Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site
P.O. Box 464, Bldg. T452
Golden, CO 80402-0464
Phone: 303-966-7978
Fax: 303-966-4991
E-mail: dana.dorr@rfets.gov

Ms. Kimberly C. Driggins
Economic Development Analyst
Council for Urban Economic Development
(CUED)
1730 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
Phone: 202-223-4735
Fax: 202-223-4745
E-mail: kdriggins@urbandevelopment.com

Mr. John Driskill
Executive Committee
Paducah Area Community Reuse Organization
Post Office Box 588
Mayfield, KY 42066
Phone: 502-247-7171
Fax: 502-251-6110
E-mail: puradd@apex.net

Mr. William F. Edwards
Supervisor
Site Infrastructure Division
U.S. Department of Energy
Post Office Box 550, A2-45
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-372-1291
Fax: 509-372-1291
E-mail: william_f_bill_edwards@rl.gov

Dr. G. (Jerry) R. Eisele

Director, Center for Human Reliability Studies
Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education
MS-50, P.O. Box 117
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-0117
Phone: 423-576-2208
Fax: 423-576-7903
E-mail: eiseleg@ornl.gov

Mr. Charlie Emery
Vice President, Human Resources
Sandia National Laboratories
P.O. Box 5800
MS 0186
Albuquerque, NM 87158-0186
Phone: 505-845-7692
Fax: 505-844-5238
E-mail: cemery@sandia.gov

Ms. Cecelia A. Evans
Vice President
Star Access/Star Mountain, Inc
3601 Eisenhower Avenue, Suite 450
Alexandria, VA 22304-6425
Phone: 703-317-0336
Fax: 703-960-7009
E-mail: cevans@staraccess.com

Ms. Gail Fairhurst
Professor
Center for Environmental Communication Studies
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0184
Phone: 513-556-4460
Fax: 513-556-0899
E-mail: fairhug@email.uc.edu

Mr. Sam Ferraro
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1), 6F-029/FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202/586-5057
Fax: 202/586-1737



Mr. Jeff Finkle
Executive Director
Council for Urban Economic Development
(CUED)
1730 K Street NW Suite 700
Washington, D.C., DC 20006
Phone: 202/223-4735
Fax: 202/223-4745
E-mail: jfinkle@urbandevelopment.com

Mr. Timothy Fischer
Attorney-Advisor
Savannah River Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box A
Aiken, SC 29802
Phone: 803-725-1022
Fax: 803-725-7544
E-mail: timothy.fischer@srs.gov

Ms. Amy Fitzgerald
Special Assistant to the City Manager
City of Oak Ridge
Mayor's Office
P.O. Box 1
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-0001
Phone: 423-577-1182
Fax: 423-577-3864
E-mail: fitzamy@aol.com

Mr. Ben Floyd
Economic Development Coordinator
Benton County Commissioners Office
P.O. Box 190 1766 Fowler, Suite C
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-736-3082
Fax: 509-736-2708
E-mail: floyd@co.benton.wa.us

Mr. Mike Flynn
Director, Safety & Health
International Association of Machinists
9000 Machinists Place

Upper Marlboro, MD 20772
Phone: 301-967-4704
Fax: 301-967-3431
E-mail: mflynn@iamaw.org

Ms. Clara Foster
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1), Room 6F-023/FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-5881
Fax: 202-586-1737
E-mail: clara.foster@hq.doe.gov

Mr. R.J. Fraser
Manager
Employee and Labor Relations
Sandia National Laboratory
P.O. Box 5800, MS 1025
Albuquerque, NM 87185-1025
Phone: 505-844-3115
Fax: 505-845-8816
E-mail: rjfrase@sandia.gov

Mr. Terry Freese
Deputy Director
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1) Room 6G-030/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-5907
Fax: 202-586-8403

Mr. Stacey L. Freitas
Assistant Labor Relations Representative
Labor Relations
Bechtel Nevada Corporation
Post Office Box 98521
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8552
Phone: 702-295-2303
Fax: 702-295-2908
E-mail: freitasl@nv.doe.gov



Mr. Stuart Fribush
Manager
Coopers and Lybrand Consulting
12902 Federal Systems Park Drive
Fairfax, VA 22033-4412
Phone: 703-633-4520
Fax: 703-633-6225
E-mail: stuart.fribush@us.coopers.com

Mr. David R. Fuller
President
Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers
International Union, Local 3-550
670 Springwell Lane
Paducah, KY 42001
Phone: 902-994-0812

Mr. David Garbarino
Business Manager
International Union of Operating Engineers
Local 12
360 Shadow Lane
Las Vegas, NV 89106
Phone: 702-598-1212
Fax: 702-598-1756

Mr. Arthur B Garcia
Chief of Staff
Los Alamos National Laboratory
P O Box 1663, MS P124
Los Alamos, NM 87545
Phone: 505-667-1887
Fax: 505-665-5728
E-mail: garcia_arthur_b@lanl.gov

Mr. Tom A. Garcia
Deputy Laboratory Director for Business
Administration
Business Administration
Los Alamos National Laboratory
Post Office Box 1663, MS A113
Los Alamos, NM 87545
Phone: 505-665-4234

Fax: 505-665-2679
E-mail: tagarcia@lanl.gov

Mr. Richard W. Garretson, Jr.
President
United Brotherhood of Carpenters
Local Union 2403
335 Skagit
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-375-3576
Fax: 509-375-4221
E-mail: w.w.com@aol.rich2452

Ms. Wendy Gehring
Booz, Allen & Hamilton
20201 Century Boulevard
Germantown, MD 70874
Phone: 301-916-7388
Fax: 301-916-7277
E-mail: gehring-wendy@bah.com

Mr. Mike Gibson
Vice President
OCAW Local 07-4200
P.O. Box 3000
Miamisburg, OH 45005
Phone: 937-865-3389
E-mail: mikeg38@aol.com

Ms. Mary Gilbert
Office Manager
BDM Federal/TRW
4001 N. Fairfax Drive
Arlington, VA 22203
Phone: 703-351-6932
Fax: 703-351-6909
E-mail: mcollin2@bdm.com

Mr. Ed Gilliland
Director of Advisory Services
Council for Urban Economic Development
(CUED)
1730 K Street NW #700



Washington, DC 20006
Phone: 202-223-4735
Fax: 202-223-4745

Mr. Sam Glenn
Savannah River Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box A
Aiken, SC 29801
Phone: 803-725-2425
Fax: 803-725-1910
E-mail: melton.glenn@srs.gov

Mr. Greg J. Glynn
Manager
Labor Relations
Bechtel Nevada Corporation
P.O. Box 98521, MS- NLV021
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8521
Phone: 702-295-0173
Fax: 702-295-2908/3222
E-mail: glynn@gj@nv.doe.gov

Ms. Patti Goin
Manager
Office of Human Resources
Bechtel Nevada
P.O. Box 98521 M/S NLV009
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8521
Phone: 702-295-2294
Fax: 702-295-2448
E-mail: goinpi@nv.doe.gov

Ms. Charlene Goldman
Manager of Community Transition Program
Rocky Flats Local Impact Initiative
5460 Ward Road, Suite 205
Arvada, CO 80002
Phone: 303-940-6090
Fax: 303-940-6088
E-mail: erp@rflii.org

Mr. Mike O. Grauwelman

President
Miamisburg Mound Community Improvement
Corporation
P.O. Box 232
Miamisburg, OH 45343-0232
Phone: 937-865-4462
Fax: 937-865-4431
E-mail: mmcic@aol.com

Mr. Abe Greenberg
Project Manager
Fluor Daniel Hanford, Inc.
Post Office Box 1000 (H8-69)
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-372-2817
Fax: 509-376-2410
E-mail: abe_greenberg@rl.gov

Mr. Larry V. Gregoire
Vice President
International Chemical Workers Union
Council/UFCW
5880 Florida Blvd., Suite 310
Baton Rouge, LA 70806
Phone: 504-928-1536
Fax: 504-928-1837

Mr. Jim Hanna
Director, Industrial Relation
Fluor Daniel Hanford
P.O. Box 1000, MSIN H8-24
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-372-8229

Ms. Dorothy Hansen
Manager, Worker Transition
Human Resources
Fluor Daniel Hanford, Inc.
PO Box 1000, MS - H2-16
Richland, WA 99352-1000
Phone: 509-376-8180
Fax: 509-373-1010
E-mail: dorothy_e_hansen@rl.gov



Mr. Ken Hedman
Vice President
Bechtel Construction Company
50 Beale Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
Phone: 415-768-6282
Fax: 415-768-1883
E-mail: kehedman@bechtel.com

Mr. David Allen Henderson
Community Development Specialist
Ohio State University
Piketon Research and Extension Center
1864 Skyville Road
Piketon, OH 45661-9749
Phone: 740-289-2901
Fax: 740-289-4591
E-mail: henderson67@osu.edu

Mr. James Hendricks
Vice President
Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers
International Union, Local 3-288
Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Inc.
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-7113
Phone: 423-483-3745
Fax: 423-483-1507

Mr. Ralph Hennard
Fluor Daniel Fernald
P O Box 538704
Cincinnati, OH 45253-8704
Phone: 513-648-3303
Fax: 513-648-3601

Mr. David W. Hepner
Manager, Community Affairs
Savannah River Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box A
Aiken, SC 29802
Phone: 803-725-1206
Fax: 803-725-5968

E-mail: david.hepner@srs.gov

Mr. Martin Hewitt
Chief Steward
United Plant Guard Workers of America
Local 330
P.O. Box W
Aiken, SC 29802-0990
Phone: 803-952-7029
Fax: 803-952-7731

Mr. Jimmie Hodges
Site Office Manager
Paducah Site Office
U.S. Department of Energy
PO Box 1410
Paducah, KY 42001
Phone: 502-441-6806
Fax: 502-441-6801
E-mail: hodgesjc@ornl.gov

Mr. Henry Hodges
Executive Committee
Paducah Area Community Reuse Organization
P.O. Box 588
Mayfield, KY 42066
Phone: 502-247-7171
Fax: 502-252-6110
E-mail: puradd@apex.net

Ms. Susan Holliday-Cox
StarAccess, Inc.
11904 #T-4 Parklawn Place
Rockville, MD 20852
Phone: 202-586-2656
Fax: 202-586-2522

Mr. Robert Hottel
Manager, Economic Transition
Westinghouse Savannah River Company
Savannah River Site
Aiken, SC 29808
Phone: 803-725-7600



Fax: 803-725-1036
E-mail: robert.hottel@srs.gov

Ms. Jane Howard
Export Administrative Manager
Bechtel Corporation
1015 Fifteenth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-828-7374
Fax: 202-785-2645
E-mail: jahoward@bechtel.com

Mr. Walter Howes
Contract Reform and Privatization Project Office
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-0800
Fax: 202-586-1025

Mr. Shawn W. Hughes
Deputy General Manager
MK-Ferguson of Oak Ridge Company
P O Box 2011
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Phone: 423-576-3541
Fax: 423-574-1814
E-mail: hughessw@mkf.ornl.gov

Mr. Leroy Jobe
General Treasurer
International Guards Union
1703 Jasmine Street
Amarillo, TX 79107
Phone: 806-383-9903
Fax: 806-383-1329
E-mail: igua2@amaonline.com

Mr. Earl Johnson
Vice President
Atomic Trades and Labor Council
Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Inc.
Post Office Box 2009

Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Phone: 423-241-3200
Fax: 423-574-0482

Mr. Gary Jones
Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education
Room 6G-069/FORS (WT-1)
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-0473
Fax: 202-586-1540

Mr. Bob Juba
Pantex Coordinator
Amarillo Economic Development Corporation
600 S. Tyler, Suite 1503
Amarillo, TX 79101
Phone: 806-371-7199
Fax: 806-371-0112
E-mail: bob@aedc.com

Mr. Peter Karcz
Office of Environmental and Regulatory Analysis
U.S. Department of Energy
(EM-75) Room 1H-088/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-0488
Fax: 202-586-9732
E-mail: peter.karcz@em.doe.gov

Mr. Dennis Kelly
Integrated Safety Process Program Manager
Amarillo Area Office
U S Department of Energy
Highway #60 at FM2373
Amarillo, TX 79177
Phone: 806-477-7161
Fax: 806-477-5893
E-mail: dkelly@pantex.doe.gov

Mr. Thomas Kelly
Golden Field Office
U.S. Department of Energy
1617 Cole Boulevard



Golden, CO 80401
Phone: 303-275-4759
Fax: 303-275-4788
E-mail: tom_kelly@nrel.gov

Ms. Almira Kennedy
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
WT-1, Room 6G-030
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-7783
Fax: 202-586-8403

Mr. Jim H. Key
Union Representative
OCAW, Local 3-550
P.O. Box 9503
Paducah, KY 42002
Phone: 502-441-6576
Fax: 502-441-6024
E-mail: njnkey@hcis.net

Mr. Mike Keyes
Fluor Daniel Fernald
P.O. Box 538704
Cincinnati, OH 45253-8704
Phone: 513-648-3303
Fax: 513-648-3601

Mr. Seth Kirshenberg
Executive Director
Energy Community Alliance
1101 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: 202-828-2317
Fax: 202-828-2188
E-mail: sethk@energyca.org

Mr. Brent Knowles
Human Resources Specialist
Mason & Hanger Corporation
Bldg. 16-12 P O Box 30020
Amarillo, TX 79120-0020

Phone: 806-477-5860
Fax: 806-477-7806
E-mail: bknowles@pantex.com

Mr. Tim Knowles
Director
Westlakes Science and Technology Park
Moor Row
Cumbria CA24 3JY, England
Phone: 01946514134
Fax: 01946514114
E-mail: tim@tknowles.demon.co.uk

Ms. Elaine Kocolowski
Team Leader, Contractor Industrial Relations
Chicago Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
9800 South Cass Avenue
Argonne, IL 60439
Phone: 630-252-2334
Fax: 630-252-2919
E-mail: elaine.kocolowski@ch.doe.gov

Mr. Michael P. Kuberski
Executive Secretary/Treasurer
Rocky Mountain Regional Council of Carpenters
5155 E 39th Avenue
Denver, CO 80207-1108
Phone: 303-355-8774
Fax: 303-355-1092

Mr. Ric Ladit
Executive Committee
Paducah Area Community Reuse Organization
Post Office Box 588
Mayfield, KY 42066
Phone: 202-247-7171
Fax: 202-251-6110
E-mail: puradd@apex.net

Mr. James H. Lander
Deputy Director, Human Resources
Westinghouse Savannah River Company



Building 703A
Room A-212
Aiken, SC 29808
Phone: 803-725-8451
Fax: 803-7225-1991

Mr. Barry R. Lawson
President
Barry Lawson Associates
Old Cemetery Road
P.O. Box 26
Peacham, VT 05862-0026
Phone: 802-592-3949
Fax: 802-592-3950

Mr. David H. Leffen, Sr.
President
UPGWA Local 109
338 New Midway Road
Kingston, TN 37831
Phone: 423-376-4576

Mr. Stephen Lerner
Congressional Liaison
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585
Phone: 202-586-5470
Fax: 202-596-0143

Mr. Walt Lips
Field Coordination Advisor
Defense Programs
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585
Phone: 202-586-1806
Fax: 202-586-1873

Ms. Sheila K. Little
Vice President
Reengineering/CPI, Economic Transition and
Communications

Fluor Daniel Hanford, Inc.
P.O. Box 1000
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-376-9315
Fax: 509-372-1050

Ms. Paula R. Littles
Citizenship-Legislative Director
Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International
Union/AFL-CIO
2722 Merrilee Drive, Suite 250
Fairfax, VA 22031
Phone: 703-876-9300
Fax: 703-876-8952
E-mail: ocawleg@aol.com

Mr. Chris Logan
Managing Editor
Weapons Complex Monitor
1826 Jefferson Place
Washington, D.C. 20006
Phone: 202-296-2814, ext. 20
Fax: 202-296-2805

Mr. Burke R. Long
Vice President, Local 2-652
430 Melrose
Idaho Falls, ID 83401
Phone: 208-523-7144
Fax: 208-524-9901

Mr. Charles M. Lopez
Business Agent
Hanford Guards Union, Local 21
1305 Knight Street
P.O. Box 687
Richland, WA
Phone: 509-946-8785

Mr. Tom Lukow
Director, Assets Management Division
Rocky Flats Field Office
U.S. Department of Energy



P.O. Box 928, Bldg. 116
Golden, CO 80402
Phone: 303-966-4561
Fax: 303-966-2994
E-mail: tom.lukow@rfets.gov

Mr. Lee Lyon
Director of Personnel
Stanford Linear Accelerator Center
P O Box 4349, MS 11
Stanford, CA 94309
Phone: 650-926-2283
Fax: 650-926-4999
E-mail: lyon@slac.stanford.edu

Mr. Skip Maas
Maintenance Staff
Mason & Hanger Corporation
P.O. Box 30020
Amarillo, TX 79120-0020
Phone: 806-477-5846
Fax: 806-477-3448
E-mail: smaas@pantex.com

Mr. Ed Manning
Construction Manager/Manager of Labor Relations
Bechtel Savannah River, Inc.
Building 794-5N, Room 150
Aiken, SC 29808
Phone: 803-557-5667
Fax: 803-557-4707
E-mail: edward.manning@srs.gov

Mr. Charles Maples
Executive Secretary - Treasurer
Tennessee Carpenters District Council
1451 Elm Hill Pike, Suite 106
Nashville, TN 37210
Phone: 615-366-3149
Fax: 615-366-3303

Mr. Rick Marcum
Executive Director

Los Alamos Regional Development Corporation
P.O. Box 6850
Santa Fe, NM 87504
Phone: 505-820-1226
Fax: 505-992-0702

Mr. Jim Martin
Executive Committee
Paducah Area Community Reuse Organization
P.O. Box 588
Mayfield, KY 42066
Phone: 502-247-7171
Fax: 502-251-6110
E-mail: puradd@apex.net

Mr. Dale M. Martinez
Secretary/Treasurer
International Union of Police Associations
Local 7002
512 Chama NE Suite A
Albuquerque, NM 87108
Phone: 505-265-7809
Fax: 505-265-0647

Mr. Pat J. Marx
Chief Operating Officer
Lovelace Respiratory Research Institute
2425 Ridgcrest SE
Albuquerque, NM 87108
Phone: 505-262-7938
Fax: 505-262-7043
E-mail: pmarx@lucy.tli.org

Mr. Ken Matthews
Health Systems Specialist
Office of Environment, Safety, and Health
U.S. Department of Energy
(EH-61) Room 4059 / 270 CC
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 301-903-6398
Fax: 301-903-5072
E-mail: kenmatthews@doe.eh.gov



Mr. R.D. Maynard
President
Idaho Building and Construction Trades
P.O. Box 1284
Pocatello, ID 83204
Phone: 202-232-8492
Fax: 202-232-8493

Mr. Michael M. McCann
Attorney-Advisor
Rocky Flats Field Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P O Box 928
Golden, CO 80402-0928
Phone: 303-966-5660
Fax: 303-966-3717
E-mail: michael.mccann@rfets.gov

Dr. Eileen McNeely
Research Assistant Professor
Boston University
School of Public Health
80 East Concord Street/Talbot 3C
Boston, MA 02118-2394
Phone: 617-638-5071
Fax: 617-638-4857
E-mail: emcneely@bu.edu

Mr. John F. Meese
President
Metal Trades Department, AFL-CIO
815 Sixteenth Street N W
Washington, DC 20006-4189
Phone: 202-347-7255
Fax: 202-347-0181

Mr. J.M. Meredith
Vice President, Human Resources
Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Inc.
P O Box 2009, MS-8004
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-8004

Phone: 423-574-1612
Fax: 423-576-8697

Mr. John T. Merwin
Manager, Human Resources
Fluor Daniel Fernald
175 Tri County Parkway
Cincinnati, OH 45246
Phone: 513-648-6442
Fax: 513-648-6905
E-mail: john_merwin@fernald.gov

Mr. Mike Mescher
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
WT-1 Room 6G-041/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-3924
Fax: 202-586-1540

Ms. Miriam Messinger
Project Manager
Boston University
School of Public Health
715 Albany Street/Talbot 2E
Boston, MA 02118
Phone: 617-638-5835
Fax: 617-638-4857
E-mail: mmessing@bu.edu

Ms. Karen Meyer-Cain
Director of Human Resources
TRW Environmental Safety System, Inc.
2650 Park Tower Drive
Suite 800
Vienna, VA 22180
Phone: 703-204-8986
Fax: 703-204-8979
E-mail: karen.meyer-cain@rw.doe.gov

Ms. Natalie Mills
Economic Development Specialist
Economic Development Administration



HCHB-Room 7327
14th & Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20032
Phone: 202-482-5813
Fax: 202-482-3742

Mr. Michael Milnes
Senior Public Relations Specialist
Westinghouse Savannah River Company
Building 742-A
Aiken, SC 29808
Phone: 803-725-2854
E-mail: michael.milnes@srs.gov

Mr. Ken Mireles
Special Assistant
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Room 6F-029
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-0303
Fax: 202-586-1540

Ms. Jane Monhart
Deputy Director
Contract Reform and Privatization
Project Office
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585
Phone: 202-586-0800
Fax: 202-586-1025

Mr. Jack Monrean
Manager, Labor Relations
Bechtel Hanford, Inc.
3350 George Washington Way
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-375-4683
Fax: 509-372-9417
E-mail: jrmonrea@bhi-erc.com

Mr. Randy Morgan
Senior Labor Relations Specialist
Johnson Controls Northern New Mexico
Post Office Box 50
Los Alamos, NM 87544
Phone: 505-667-4266
Fax: 505-667-9224

Mr. David M. Navarro
Grievance Negotiating Committee
United Steelworkers of America
Local 8031
7850 Yates Street
Westminster, CO 80030
Phone: 303-427-6134
Fax: 303-427-3382
E-mail: davnarvarro@aol.com

Mr. Mike Neal
Vice President
OCAW 3-689
1442 Timberlake Drive
Portsmouth, OH 45662
Phone: 740-289-2405
Fax: 740-289-2126

Mr. William Neff
Community Reuse Program Manager
Rocky Flats Local Impacts Initiative
5460 Ward Road
Suite 205
Arvada, CO 80002
Phone: 303-940-6090
Fax: 303-940-6088
E-mail: will@rflii.org

Mr. Doug Nelson
Financial Secretary-Treasurer
United Plant Guard Workers of America
Local 109
112 Concord Road
Oak Ridge, TN 37830
Phone: 423-483-8098



Mr. Gary Nolley
President
Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International
Union,
Local 7-4200
1026 Sundance Drive
Miamisburg, OH 45343
Phone: 937-865-3389
Fax: 937-865-3679

Ms. Melanie Norton
Account Executive
Merit Behavioral Care
320 North Cedar Bluff Road
Suite 230
Knoxville, TN 37923
Phone: 423-690-0068
Fax: 423-690-0257
E-mail: msnorton@compuserve.com

Ms. Emily P. Nunn
Career Center Manager
Lockheed Martin Energy Systems
P.O. Box 2009, MS8078
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-8078
Phone: 423-576-4269
Fax: 423-241-2056
E-mail: epn@ornl.gov

Mr. David O'Connell
Boston University
School of Management
96 Common Street
Belmont, MA 02178
Phone: 617-484-7948

Mr. Felix Ortiz, Jr.
Chief, Contractor Human Resources Branch
Albuquerque Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P O Box 5400
Albuquerque, NM 87185-5400
Phone: 505-845-4207

Fax: 505-845-4715
E-mail: fortiz@doeal.gov

Mr. Archie Owens
Senior HR Representative
Westinghouse Savannah River Company
Building 703-A-A129 Road 1A
Aiken, SC 29801
Phone: 803-725-7774
Fax: 803-725-7731
E-mail: archie.owens@srs.gov

Mr. John Pantaleo
Financial and Business Manager
Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology
U.S. Department of Energy
19901 Germantown Road
Germantown, MD 20874
Phone: 301-903-2525
Fax: 301-903-5434
E-mail: john.pantaleo@hq.doe.gov

Mr. Craig S. Parker
Labor Relations Manager
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
Post Office Box 999, P7-64
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-376-8267
Fax: 509-372-1563
E-mail: cs-parker@pnl.gov

Mr. Joseph Pastel
Program Manager
Science Applications International Corporation
(SAIC)
901 D Street, S.W., Suite 201
Washington, DC 20024
Phone: 202-488-6603
Fax: 202-488-3776
E-mail: joseph.a.pastel@cpmx.saic.com

The Honorable Jerry Peltier
Mayor



City of West Richland
4301 Laurel Drive
West Richland, WA
Phone: 509-373-5352
Fax: 509-372-1498

Mr. Robert Perko
Labor Relations Manager
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
P.O. Box 808
L-708
Livermore, California
Phone: 925-422-9501

Ms. Beverly Peterson
Human Resource Manager
Babcox & Wilcox of Ohio
P.O. Box 3030
Miamisburg, OH 45343-3030
Phone: 937-865-4448
Fax: 937-847-5261
E-mail: peteba@doe.mo.gov

Ms. Christine A. Phoebe
Assistant Manager for Business Services
Golden Field Office
U.S. Department of Energy
1617 Cole Boulevard
Golden, CO 80401-3305
Phone: 303-275-4752
Fax: 303-275-4790
E-mail: chris_phoebe@tnrel.gov

Ms. Sandi Pike
Contractor Industrial Relations Specialist
Savannah River Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P O Box A
Aiken, SC 29802
Phone: 803-725-5904
Fax: 805-725-8573
E-mail: sandra.pike@srs.gov

Mr. Clayton L. Plemmons
International Representative
LIUNA
5845 Live Oak Parkway
Norcross, GA 30093
Phone: 703-263-7662

Mr. Jim Powers
Acting President & Site Project Manager
Babcock & Wilcox of Ohio
P.O. Box 3030
Miamisburg, OH 45343-3030
Phone: 937-865-3865
Fax: 937-865-3114

Mr. Geoffrey Quinn
Field Coordinator
Northern California Teamsters Apprenticeship
Training
Post Office Box 1404
Rancho Murieta, CA 95683
Phone: 916-354-2122
Fax: 919-354-2234

Mr. Kristin Reese
Executive Committee
Paducah Area Community Reuse Organization
Post Office Box 588
Mayfield, KY 42055
Phone: 502-547-7171
Fax: 502-547-6110
E-mail: puradd@apex.net

Ms. Ann L. Rigell
Director, Human Resources Development &
Performance
Oak Ridge Associated Universities
P.O. Box 117
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-0117
Phone: 423-576-3274
Fax: 423-576-7463
E-mail: rigella@orau.gov



Ms. Lavonne C. Ritter
Commissioner
Federal Mediation & Conciliation Service
2881 Business Park Court
Suite 200
Las Vegas, NV 89128
Phone: 702-363-5957
Fax: 702-363-6019

Mr. Mike Robinson
Manager, Employee Relations
Wackenhut Services, Inc.
Savannah River Site
P.O. Drawer W
Aiken, SC 29802
Phone: 803-952-7600
Fax: 803-952-9042

Mr. Bob M. Rosselli
Assistant Manager
Office of Science and Technology
U.S. Department of Energy
825 Jadwin Avenue
P.O. Box 550, K-50
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-372-4005
Fax: 509-372-4532
E-mail: robert_m_rosselli@rl.gov

Mr. Joseph Roybal
Business Agent
International Guards Union of America
Local 69
P O Box 1400
Los Alamos, NM 87545
Phone: 505-665-1926
Fax: 505-665-7759

Mr. Randy Runyon
Chairperson
Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative
941 Market Street
P.O. Box 799

Piketon, OH 45661
Phone: 614-289-2371
Fax: 614-289-4291
E-mail: rrunyon@bright.net

Mr. Dom Sansotta
Contractor Workforce Program Manager
Richland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P O Box 550, A6-36
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-376-7221
Fax: 509-376-8142
E-mail: dominic_j_sansotta@rl.gov

Ms. Toni M. Sawyer
Sr. Human Resources Representative
West Valley Nuclear Services Co., Inc.
10282 Rock Springs Road PO Box 191
West Valley, NY 14171-0191
Phone: 716-942-4949
Fax: 716-942-4096
E-mail: sawyer@wv.doe.gov

Mr. Carl (Bubba) Scarbrough
President, Atomic Trades and Labor Council
Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Inc
P.O. Box 4068
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-4068
Phone: 423-574-8434
Fax: 423-576-7082
E-mail: cls@ornl.gov

Mr. Tom Schaffer
Secretary/Treasurer
Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council
(HAMTC)
3100 George Washington Way
Richland, WA 99352-3407
Phone: 509-373-6093

Ms. Laura L. Scott
Education Training Specialist



Scott Engineering & Resources, Inc.
53518 Hannett, NE
Albuquerque, NM 87106
Phone: 505-845-5240
Fax: 505-845-4883
E-mail: scott@doeal.gov

Mr. Dave Shelton
General President
International Guards Union of America
Route 8, Box 3214
Amarillo, TX 79118
Phone: 806-622-2424
Fax: 806-622-3500
E-mail: igua@amaonline.com

Mr. Roger Shomers
Organizer/Field Representative
Rocky Mountain Regional Council of Carpenters
5155 E 39th Avenue
Denver, CO 80207-1108
Phone: 303-355-8774
Fax: 303-355-1092

Mr. Winfred E. Shoopman
Anderson County Commissioner
Anderson County Government
100 N. Main Street
Clinton, TN 37716
Phone: 423-457-3673
E-mail: commish@aol.com

Mr. John C. Simon
Executive Board
Independent Guard Association of Nevada
P.O. Box 41
Mercury, NV 89023
Phone: 702-259-6245
Fax: 702-259-0010

Mr. Robert G. Sisterman
Manager, Human Resources/Labor Relations
Wackenhut Services, Inc.

P.O. Box 96027
Las Vegas, NV 89193-6027
Phone: 702-295-0811
Fax: 702-295-1838

Ms. Mary Skriba
Fluor Daniel Hanford
P.O. Box 1000 / MS H8-64
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-376-8140
Fax: 509-372-2454
E-mail: mary_skriba@rl.gov

Mr. Matt Slavin
Business & Economic Development Manager
City of Richland
Post Office Box 190
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-942-7582
Fax: 509-942-7771
E-mail: matts@ci.richland.wa.us

Mr. Gary A. Slaydon
Field Coordinator
LIUNA Tri-funds
P O Box 1686
DeRidder, LA 70634
Phone: 318-463-3864
Fax: 318-463-6423
E-mail: trifund@worldnetla.net

Mr. Duane Smith
Garage Mechanic/Co-Chair VPP
Mason & Hanager Corp.
Pantex Plant
Post Office Box 30020, Building 16-1
Amarillo, TX 79120-0020
Phone: 806-477-3441
Fax: 806-477-3419

Ms. Cherie Smith
HR Specialist
Richland Operations Office



U.S. Department of Energy
Post Office Box 1000, HG2-16
Richland, WA 99336
Phone: 509-372-8231
Fax: 509-372-1010
E-mail: cherie_h_smith@rl.gov

Mr. Larry Smith
OCAW-Division I Committeeperson
Wakefield Mound Road
Piketon, Ohio 45661
Phone: 740-289-2405
Fax: 740-289-2126

Ms. Laurel Smith
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1) Room 6G-051/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-4091
Fax: 202-586-1540

Mr. Mike Smith
State of Oklahoma
1140 N.W. 63rd Street
Oklahoma City, OK 73116
Phone: 405-840-9228
Fax: 405-840-2638

Mr. Daniel Sours
Program Manager
Science Applications International Corporation
3250 Port of Benton Blvd
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-372-7714
Fax: 509-372-7701
E-mail: daniel_l_sours@cpmx.saic.com

Mr. Kenneth A. Sprankle
Program Manager
Ohio Field Office
P.O. Box 3020
Miamisburg, OH 45343-3020

Phone: 937-865-3649
Fax: 937-865-3843
E-mail: kenneth.sprankle@em.doe.gov

Ms. Kristine Stanger
Privatization Project Officer, Program Manager
Lockheed Martin Idaho Technologies Company
P.O. Box 1625
Idaho Falls, ID 83415
Phone: 208-526-0909
Fax: 208-526-4563
E-mail: sck@inel.gov

Mr. Sandy Stiffman
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1), Room 6F-029/FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202/586-4107
Fax: 202/586-1737

Mr. Sean Stockard
Economic Transition Program Director
Tri-City Industrial Development Council
901 North Colorado Street
Kennewick, WA 99336
Phone: 509-735-1000 225
Fax: 509-735-6609
E-mail: sstock@owt.com

Mr. David Stoeckle
Senior Human Relations Specialist
Johnson Controls Northern New Mexico
1350 Central
Los Alamos, NM 37544
Phone: 505-667-42656
Fax: 505-667-9224

Ms. Linda H. Strickland
Labor Relations Manager
Bechtel Savannah River, Inc.
Building 719-5N, Room 154
Aiken, SC 29808



Phone: 803-557-5395
Fax: 803-557-4707
E-mail: linda.strickland@srs.gov

Ms. Jean Stucky
Attorney-Advisor
Office of General Counsel
U.S. Department of Energy
(GC-51) Room 6A-113/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-7532
Fax: 202-586-7373

Ms. Deborah Sullivan
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1) Room 6G-059/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-0452
Fax: 202-586-1540

Ms. Sandra White Summey
Human Resources/Diversity Manager
MK-Ferguson of Oak Ridge Company
Post Office Box 2011
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-2011
Phone: 423-576-1618
Fax: 423-574-2843
E-mail: summeysw@mkf.ornl.gov

Ms. Deborah H. Sumner
Manufacturing Education and Training Manager
Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Inc
P.O. Box 2009, MS - 8091 Bld. 9737
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-8084
Phone: 423-241-3111
Fax: 423-574-2000
E-mail: sumnerdn@ornl.gov

Ms. Deborah Swichkow
Deputy Director
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy

(WT-1) Room 6G-030/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-0876
Fax: 202-586-8403

Mr. Robert G. Tabor
Trustee
Fernald Community Reuse Organization
214 Citation Circle
Harrison, OH 45093
Phone: 513-648-5077
Fax: 513-648-5527
E-mail: robert.tabor@fernald.gov

Ms. Margo Triassi
Acting Team Leader, Industrial Relations
Oakland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
1301 Clay Street
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510-637-1843
Fax: 510-637-2008
E-mail: margo.triassi@oak.doe.gov

Ms. Judy Trimble
Staffing and Employment Manager
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
P.O. Box 2008
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6212
Phone: 423-574-4429
Fax: 423-574-4441
E-mail: jui@ornl.gov

Mr. David Trojnar
President & CEO
PerforMax
7887 Bryan Dairy Road
Suite 130
Largo, FL 33777
Phone: 813-548-2905
Fax: 813-548-0087

Mr. Bill A. Truex



Chief Industrial Personnel
Oak Ridge Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 2001, M/S - AD 441
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-8791
Phone: 423-576-0662
Fax: 423-576-6964
E-mail: truexwa@oro.doe.gov

Mr. Ram Y. Uppuluri
Senior Advisor
Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental
Affairs
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585
Phone: 202-586-0153
Fax: 202-586-4891
E-mail: ram.uppuluri@hq.doe.gov

Ms. Cris Van Horn
Business Development Manager
Savannah River Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
AMSTBD PO Box A
Aiken, SC 29802
Phone: 803-725-5313
Fax: 803-725-5968
E-mail: cris.vanhorn@srs.gov

Mr. Don Vaverka
Human Resources Manager
BDM Oklahoma, Inc.
P.O. Box 2565
Bartlesville, OK 74005-2565
Phone: 918-337-4223
Fax: 918-337-4363
E-mail: dvaverka@bdmok.com

Ms. Donna L. Vigil
Administrative Specialist
Los Alamos National Laboratory
U.S. Department of Energy

528 35th Street
Los Alamos, NM 87544
Phone: 505-667-5105
Fax: 505-665-1718
E-mail: dvigil@doe.lanl.gov

Mr. Jay Vivari
Congressional & Intergovernmental Affairs
U.S. Department of Energy
(CI-10) Room 8G-048/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-5143
Fax: 202-586-0539
E-mail: jay.vivari@hq.doe.gov

Mr. Charles A Washington
Environmental Engineer
Oak Ridge Reservation Environmental Management
118 Decatur Road
Oak Ridge, TN 37830
Phone: 423-576-6015
Fax: 423-574-1880
E-mail: wac@ornl.gov

Mr. Brian Weber
Manager, Labor Relations
Wackenhut Services Inc.
Savannah River Site
P.O. Drawer W
Aiken, SC 29802
Phone: 803-952-7997
Fax: 803-952-9042
E-mail: b.weber@srs.gov

Mr. Edgar West
Business Manager
Ironworkers, Local 709
409 Grange Road
Port Wentworth, GA 31407
Phone: 912-964-6931
Fax: 912-964-8801

Mr. Earl Whiteman



Albuquerque Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 5400
Albuquerque, NM 87185-5400
Phone: 505-845-6038
Fax: 505-845-4837

Ms. Dotti J. Whitt
Director, Human Resources & Organization
Management Division
Rocky Flats Field Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Post Office Box 928
Golden, CO 80402
Phone: 303-966-8240
Fax: 303-966-7040
E-mail: dotti.whitt@rfets.gov

Ms. Janice Wiedemann
Vice President, Administration
NIS Development Corporation
2340 Paseo del Brado, Suite D-108
Las Vegas, NV 89102
Phone: 702-257-7900
Fax: 702-257-7999
E-mail: jwiedemann@ntsdev.com

Ms. Natasha Wieschenberg
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1) Room 6G-051/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-5830
Fax: 202-586-8403
E-mail: natasha.wieschenberg@hq.doe.gov

Mr. Douglas E. Wilfon
President
Metal Trades Council, AFL-CIO
Sandia National Laboratories
1030 San Pedro NE
Albuquerque, NM 87110
Phone: 505-268-3242

Fax: 505-266-4430

Mr. Martin Willhite
Project Manager
Mason and Hanger Corporation
Pantex Plant
P.O. Box 30020
Amarillo, TX 79120-0020
Phone: 806-477-3712
Fax: 806-477-5447
E-mail: mwillhit@pantex.com

Mr. Charles F. Williams
President
Local 146 United Plant Guard Workers of America
P.O. Box 3000
Mound Road
Miamisburg, OH 45435
Phone: 937-865-3118

Ms. Carol J. Wilson
Contractor Industrial Relations Specialist
Ohio Field Office
U.S. Department of Energy
1 Mound Road
Miamisburg, OH 45342
Phone: 937-865-3871
Fax: 937-865-3843
E-mail: carolwilson@doe.gov

Ms. Mary G. Wilson
President
Transitions to Tomorrow, Inc.
6605 Uptown Boulevard NE
Suite 390
Albuquerque, NM 87110
Phone: 505-878-0430
Fax: 505-889-8086
E-mail: t3wilson@aol.com

Mr. Theodore A. Wolff
Senior Member of Technical Staff
Sandia National Laboratories



Post Office Box 5808
Albuquerque, NM 87185-1313
Phone: 505-284-5204
Fax: 505-284-5210
E-mail: tawolff@sandia.gov

Mr. Jim Woolford
Director
Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Office
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street, SW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: 202-260-1606
Fax: 202-260-5646

Mr. Jim Worthington
Nuclear and Hazardous Materials Specialist
Sheet Metal Workers International Union
30330 80th Avenue, N.W.
Stanwood, WA 98292
Phone: 360-629-4348
Fax: 360-629-4086

Mr. Rusty Wright
Recording Secretary
OPEIU Local 251

Sandia National Laboratories
P.O. Box 5800 - MS0603
Albuquerque, NM 87185-0603
Phone: 505-844-6635
Fax: 505-844-8985
E-mail: mrwrigh@sandia.gov

Mr. Michael (Mike) Wright
Vice President
UPGWA, Local 251
Allied Signal Federal Manufacturing &
Technologies
P.O. Box 419159
Kansas, MO 64141-6159
Phone: 816-997-3601
Fax: 816-997-2664
E-mail: wright@kcp.com

Mr. Lawrence T. Young
President
Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee
107 Lea Way
P.O. Box 2110
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-2110
Phone: 423-482-1336
Fax: 423-482-6126
E-mail: younglt@croet.com



APPENDIX B WORKSHOP AGENDA

TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 1998

10:00 - 5:00 p.m.	Exhibit Registration and Set-up	Washington-Lee Ballroom
2:00 - 5:00 p.m.	Workshop Registration	Washington-Lee Ballroom
<u>Related Meetings</u>		
8:30 - 11:30 a.m.	Contractor HR Council - Working Group Meeting (Sponsored by John Edmondson, DOE/HR)	Fairfax Room North
1:00 - 5:00 p.m.	DOE Employee Session	Washington Ballroom
9:00 - 5:00 p.m.	Community Reuse Organizations	Fairfax Room South
1:00 - 5:00 p.m.	Labor Organizations	Cameron Room

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 1998

7:00 - 8:00 a.m.	Exhibit Registration and Set-up	Washington-Lee Ballroom
7:30 - 8:30 a.m.	Workshop Registration	Washington-Lee Ballroom
8:30 - 12:00 noon	Opening Plenary Session	Washington-Lee Ballroom
8:30 - 9:15 a.m.	Opening Remarks Speaker: Robert W. DeGrasse, Director, Office of Worker and Community Transition	
9:15-10:30 a.m.	Featured Speaker Speaker: Ms. Lavonne Ritter, Federal Mediation & Conciliation Service	
10:30-11:00 a.m.	Break	
11:00-11:30 a.m.	Keynote Speaker Speaker: Federico Peña, Secretary of Energy	
11:30-12 noon	Questions and Answers	



12:00 - 1:30 p.m. **Lunch** (on your own)

1:30 - 3:00 p.m. **Small Group Discussions - Concurrent Session 1**

1A. ***Impact of Work Force Restructuring on Remaining and Transitioning Employees*** **Washington Ballroom**

Moderator: Marilyn Balcombe, ORISE

Speakers: Eileen McNeely, Boston University School of Public Health
David O'Connell, Boston University School of Management
Gail Fairhurst, University of Cincinnati
Susan Holliday-Cox, Star Access, Inc.

This session will provide an overview of the impact of work force restructuring on remaining and transitioning employees. Topics will include effective ways to mitigate the impact of work force restructuring on the remaining work force, effective communication and leadership styles for transition, and how to best help individuals who leave DOE contractor sites.

1B. ***Integrated Safety Management Program*** **Lee Ballroom**

Moderator: Barry Lawson, Lawson and Associates

Speakers: Juan Alvarez, Mason & Hanger Corporation, Pantex Plant
Duane Smith, Metal Trades Council, Pantex Plant
Skip Maas, Mason & Hanger Corporation, Pantex Plant
Dennis Kelly, Amarillo Area Office, U.S. Department of Energy

Representatives from the DOE Pantex Plant will discuss their safety program and efforts made by both labor and management to make this initiative a success.

3:00 - 3:30 p.m. **Break**

3:30 - 5:00 p.m. **Small Group Discussions - Concurrent Session 2**

2A. ***Department's Privatization Program: Current Status*** **Washington Ballroom**

Moderator: Barry Lawson, Lawson and Associates

Speakers: Walter Howes, Contract Reform and Privatization Project Office,
U.S. Department of Energy

This session will look at Department of Energy's perspectives on privatization and related work force transition issues. There will be an open discussion on the draft DOE Privatization Principles and Checklist.

2B. ***Lessons Learned in Community Transition Activities*** **Lee Ballroom**



Moderator: Bob Baney, Office of Worker and
Community Transition

Speakers: David Trojnar, PerforMax

Tim Carlson, NTS Development Corporation

Jeff Finkle, National Council for Urban Economic Development

This session will discuss a retrospective and futuristic look at site closure, business development, and the cost per job performance measures vs. other performance measures which indicates grant funds are being well spent.

3:30 - 5:00 p.m.

Small Group Discussions - Concurrent Session 2 Con't

Fairfax Room

2C. ***Consolidated Contract for the Nuclear Weapons
Industrial Complex***

Moderator: Marilyn Balcombe, ORISE

Speakers: Earl Whiteman, Albuquerque Operations Office,
U.S. Department of Energy

Felix Ortiz, Albuquerque Operations Office, U.S. Department of Energy

The U.S. Department of Energy is actively considering the consolidation of its nuclear weapons industrial activities into a single contract. This would include the existing contracts at the Kansas City Plant, the Y-12 Plant in Tennessee, and the Pantex Plant in Texas; and potentially, the weapons production responsibilities at Sandia and Los Alamos National Laboratories in New Mexico and tritium operations at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina. This session will provide representatives from the Albuquerque Operations Office to explain the consolidation concept and to answer questions.

5:30 - 8:00 p.m.

Reception

Chequers Lounge

THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 1998

8:00 - 8:30 a.m.

Workshop Registration

**Washington-Lee
Ballroom**

8:30 - 10:00 a.m.

Plenary Session

Meeting Tomorrow's Challenges (Early Site Closures) **Washington-Lee**

Moderator: John Merwin, Fluor Daniel Fernald

Ballroom

Speakers: G. Leah Dever, Ohio Field Office, U.S. Department of Energy

Jim Powers, Babcock & Wilcox of Ohio

Gary Nolley, Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers

Int'l Union (OCAW), Local 7-4200

Richard Church, Mayor, City of Miamisburg



Representatives from the Mound Plant will share their on-going experiences in the accelerated closure of the site. This will include discussions of cross-cutting issues including work force planning, skills mix, and training for future employment opportunities both inside and outside DOE. This challenge affects DOE, contractor management, work force/labor, and the community and will require innovative and creative solutions.

10:00 - 10:30 a.m.

Break

10:30 - 12:00 noon

Small Group Discussions - Concurrent Session 3

3A.

Planning Guidance for Contractor Work Force Restructuring**Washington Ballroom**

Moderator: Barry Lawson, Lawson and Associates

Speakers: Terry Freese, Office of Worker and Community Transition

Bob Card, Kaiser-Hill Rocky Flats

This open discussion session will cover issues raised in draft revisions to the Planning Guidance for Contractor Work Force Restructuring.

10:30 - 12:00 noon

Small Group Discussions - Concurrent Session 3 Con't

3B.

Asset Disposition Pilot Projects**Lee Ballroom**

Moderator: Rich Aiken, Office of Worker and Community Transition

Speakers: Stuart Fribush, Coopers and Lybrand

Lawrence Young, Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee

Tom Lukow, Rocky Flats Field Office, U.S. Department of Energy

This session will discuss opportunities and case studies on current asset disposition projects. The goal of these projects are to reduce the cost of decommissioning and decontaminating facilities and related clean-up through leveraging unneeded DOE assets. Topics will include the results of an independent management firm's recommendations in this area; the potential role of Community Reuse Organizations in asset dispositions; and the benefits of new legislation designed to help defray the cost of dispositions.

12 noon - 12:30 p.m.

Lunch (on your own)

12:30 - 1:15 p.m.

Lunch Plenary Presentation**Cameron Room**

Topic: Harnessing the Contracting Process to Encourage

Local Growth

Speaker: Tom Garcia, Los Alamos National Laboratory

1:30 - 3:00 p.m.

Small Group Discussions - Concurrent Session 4

**4A. Labor-Management Forum Washington Ballroom**

Moderator: Barry Lawson, Lawson and Associates

Speakers: John Meese, Metal Trades Department, AFL-CIO

John Bradburne, Fluor Daniel Fernald

Gene Branham, Fernald Atomic Trades and Labor Council

Greg Glynn, Bechtel Nevada Corporation

Dave Garbarino, International Union of Operating

Engineers, Local 12

Lavonne Ritter, Federal Mediation & Conciliation Service

Two panels will share their recent experiences with "Labor-Management Partnerships;" innovative collective bargaining approaches and on-going efforts.

4B. Community Transition: Property Policy Lee Ballroom

Moderator: Debby Swichkow, Office of Worker and Community Transition

Speakers: Jim Woolford, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

Bob Rosselli, Richland Operations Office, U.S. Department
of Energy

Ben Bennett, Port of Benton, Richland, WA

Robert Brown, Oak Ridge Operations Office, U.S. Department
of Energy

This session will discuss recent property transfer and leasing initiatives underway, including joint EPA/DOE policy on leasing of real property under the Hall Amendment and draft departmental guidance on property transfer. Highlighted in the session will be facility reuse successes at Port of Benton and reindustrialization activities in Oak Ridge.

3:00 - 3:30 p.m. **Break**

3:30 - 4:00 p.m. **Featured Speaker Washington Ballroom**

Title: British Experience in Economic Conversion

Speaker: Tim Knowles, International Research & Graduate Centre, Westlakes
Science & Technology Park, Great Britain

4:00 - 5:00 p.m. **Final Plenary Session Washington Ballroom**

Identification of action items and resolution of commitments